

E-filing

1 **Peter C. Clark**
 2 1674 A Pleasant Hill Rd.,
 3 Pleasant Hill, CA, 94523
 4 (925) 954-8284
 5 In pro per

FILED

OCT - 4 2010

RICHARD W. WIEKING
 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 OAKLAND

DR
 JF
 ES

ADR

6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 7 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND DIVISION**

8 **In Re**
 9 **Peter Clark, Debtor**

Case # 10-

C10-04481

RS

COMPLAINT10 **Peter Clark****Jury Trial Required**11 **Plaintiff**12 **v.**13 **Deutsche Bank National Trust Company,**
 The Honorable Bruce Mills14 **Does 1-100**15 **Defendants**16 **Related Bankruptcy Case # 10-41422 EDJ****FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION- FRAUD**

pg.33

17 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – Declaration of Constructive Trust**

pg.34

18 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION- DECLARATORY JUDGMENT**

pg.36

19 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Violations of Due Process, Civil Rights,
 and/or Federal Authority (Bankruptcy Act)**

pg.37

20 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION –VIOLATIONS OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE §17200**

pg.40

21 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION -- INJUNCTIVE RELIEF- Ex parte Young**

pg.42

22 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION - RICO CLAIMS 18 U.S.C. § 1962 (d) -**

pg.43

23 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION - RICO CLAIMS 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c)**

pg.44

24 Parties, Agency, and Jurisdiction	3
25 Synopsis of Pre-Petition Events Leading to Post Petition Damaging Acts	5
26 Post Petition Violations of Federal Authority and Due Process	7
27 Deutsche Refuses to Meet & Confer RE: Abandonment of Asset by Trustee	9
28 Background Violations of Law	14
29 Further Violations of Law	15
30 Deutsche's Lack Of Standing and Violations of Due Process	20
31 Declaratory Relief Required	21
32 Ex parte Young Injunction	24
33 Plaintiff Acted In Good Faith And Defendants Have Not	26
34 Deception and Undue Influence	28
35 Deutsche has Engaged in a Pattern of Fraud	30

1) Comes now Plaintiff Peter Clark (herein also "Mr. Clark") to allege and state the following
 2) Complaint for **Injunctive Relief and/or Damages** resulting from alleged extortion under the color
 3) of law but in violation of the Bankruptcy Act, Due Process (14th Amendment), and thus civil rights
 4) as part of an extensive fraud:

5) Said fraud began as violations of the Fair Lending Act; the Fair Debt Collection Practices
 6) Act; 15 USC 1962e] (12); Violations of Business & Professions Code §17200; RICO Act- 18
 7) U.S.C. § 1962, Fraud, and Constructive Trust alleged against the "IndyMac Party" ("Indymac" Loan
 8) Services and/or "One West" Bank) and Does 1-20 which is the subject of litigation which must be
 9) amended that Plaintiff filed prior to filing for Chapter 13 Bankruptcy, which Bankruptcy was
 10) involuntarily converted to Chapter 7 liquidation. The Trustee agreed to abandon said litigation, but
 11) the Bankruptcy Judge has not yet ordered said abandonment. The pay-off for said fraud is occurring
 12) post-petition, by alleged extortion by "Deutsche" Bank National Trust Company in apparent
 13) collusion with the Honorable Bruce Mills under the color of law.

14) 2) Deutsche filed Unlawful Detainer Case #CD10-0170 on or about March 5, 2010, during
 15) the time of the automatic bankruptcy stay in Mr. Clark's Bankruptcy (filed February 10, 2010).
 16) Deutsche's goal is to rid the property at 1674 Pleasant Hill Road in Pleasant Hill, Contra Costa
 17) County, California ("Subject Premises") of the resident owner of 30 years and his frail and elderly
 18) tenant of Unit "B," Mary Bauer. However Deutsche is alleged to lack the legal right to do so, and is
 19) thus alleged to be using vigilante means in violation of due process and federal authority.

20) 3) Deutsche is alleged to have acted in an agency relationship with others to profit from
 21) violations of due process and federal authority after alleging to foreclose on Plaintiff's home
 22) without right or authority, and to take possession without actual standing per the rulings of Federal
 23) and State courts such as shown by *In re Kang Jin Hwang*, 396 B.R. 757 (Bankr.C.D.Cal. 2008)
 24) and as shown herein. A joinder with the actual owner is required by Rule 19 (ibid.), however the
 25) Plaintiff is the legal owner. Deutsche's actions are alleged to constitute vigilante acts of fraud by a
 foreign funding pool that has no rights under State law because Deutsche appears to have not
 complied with the Business and Professions Code by filing a fictitious name statement. Deutsche is
 not a corporation or other entity that has legal rights interpreted to it under the U.S. Constitution
 either, and thus has no rights in a court. Why would the funding pool risk liability exposure to
 employees by failing to incorporate? The evidence suggests the reward may be large- tax evasion.

26) 4) Deutsche is also prevented from moving forward by collateral estoppels for lack of
 27) standing per *In Re Foreclosure Cases*," 521 F. Supp. 2d 650, 653 (S.D. Oh. 2007).

PARTIES, AGENCY, and JURISDICTION

5) This action is brought under 42 U.S.C. §1983, which Congress enacted to facilitate litigation invited by *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908) within that exception of the federal anti-injunction statute, 28 U.S.C. § 2283 (cf. *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 91 S.Ct. 746, 27 L.Ed.2d 669). This action is also brought under 18 U.S.C. § 1962 (RICO Act); and State laws related to overlapping issues that form the same case or controversy. This court has jurisdiction because Plaintiff's primary residence for all times relevant herein in this Federal District at 1674 Unit "A" or Unit "B," Pleasant Hill Road in Pleasant Hill, Contra Costa County ("Subject Property"), together with an office and (conforming) business described as:,

Lot 2, as shown on the map of Diablo View Gardens, the City of Pleasant Hill, County of Contra Costa, State of California, filed 12, March 1946, in Map Book 28, Pages 35 and 36, in the Office of the County Recorder of the County of Contra Costa.

9 6) Plaintiff received a residential loan on the Subject Property in or about 2005, from
10 information and belief, from Allstate Lending, secured by a deed of trust. "Indymac FSB" (Federal
11 Savings Bank) alleges that they received an assignment of the Note and Deed of Trust in 2005.

12 7) From information and belief, before 2008, Indymac FSB was engaged in the wholesale
13 acquisition of sub-prime Notes and Deeds of Trust after 2004 to attain windfall profits during a
14 time of lax enforcement of banking regulations, and because of the wholesale nature of their
15 actions, did not obtain the original Note and/or Deed of Trust related to said sub-prime debt, but
instead acquired electronic representations thereof.

16 8) The website maintained by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporations (FDIC) states:
17 "On July 11, 2008, IndyMac Bank, F.S.B., Pasadena, CA was closed by the Office of Thrift
18 Supervision (OTS) and the FDIC was named Conservator. All non-brokered insured deposit
accounts and substantially all of the assets of IndyMac Bank, F.S.B. have been transferred to
IndyMac Federal Bank, F.S.B. (IndyMac Federal Bank), Pasadena, CA "assuming institution") a
newly chartered full-service FDIC-insured institution."
19
20 "On March 19, 2009, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) completed the sale of
IndyMac Federal Bank, FSB, Pasadena, California, to OneWest Bank, F.S.B., Pasadena, California.
OneWest Bank, FSB is a newly formed federal savings bank organized by IMB HoldCo LLC. All
deposits of IndyMac Federal Bank, FSB have been transferred to OneWest Bank, FSB."
21 (www.fdic.gov › Industry Analysis › Failed Banks)
22
23 9) From information and belief, a group of investors created "One West" Bank as a holding
24 company to purchase Indymac FSB from the FDIC at a heavy discount. From information and
belief, One West then liquidated Indymac FSB without first transferring the Note/Deeds to a new
entity, thus allegedly eliminating any alleged secured position that said investors might have
25 alleged in the Subject Property by alleged means of said liquidated company. One West then

1 formed Indymac Loan Services, a new entity that they might allege is free of the liabilities of the
 2 past, but at the same time eliminated its assets and ability to foreclose legally on their deeds of
 3 trust. Realizing their blunder, it is alleged that One West brought in Deutsche Bank National
 4 Trust Company (herein also "Deutsche") as an alleged third party innocent buyer in alleged
 violation of Title VIII, 807, the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act 15 USC 1962e] (12).

5 10) Deutsche Bank National Trust Company (herein also "Deutsche") is alleged to be a
 6 wholly foreign owned money pool that is not a corporation or other entity that has the rights of a
 7 corporation interpreted to the United States Constitution or Federal or State Law. Deutsche
 8 claims to have the approval of the Comptroller of Currency to operate as a bank in Orange
 9 County, but after a diligent search, the evidence indicates that no entity of the name of Deutsche
 10 was registered to operate under a fictitious name in California at the time of Deutsche's filing for
 11 unlawful detainer, allegedly because they do not have the legal status to do so. As a result, the
 12 evidence indicates that Deutsche has no standing or right to avail themselves of the courts.

13 11) Why would the foreign owners of a money pool chose not to incorporate or otherwise
 14 avail themselves of the protections of the United States Constitution or register their fictitious
 15 name as required by State law? Their outlaw status risks the windfall profits that they are
 16 attaining by ignoring the loan modification guidelines that have become the policy of all major
 17 American banks. Why go out on a limb like that? From information and belief they do so:

- 18 a. to make it difficult for American Citizens to serve them with process, and/or
- 19 b. to evade American taxes on a large portion of the gains of their enterprises.

20 12) From the evidence that Deutsche has presented, Deutsche alleges that it became the
 21 trustee to allegedly hold title to the Subject Property, not for an entity, but for an *agreement of*
 22 *unknown nature* with an *entity that was liquidated* without transferring its rights. Thus Deutsche
 23 attorneys allege that Deutsche, a non-entity with no civil rights or ability to sue, holds title to the
 24 Subject Property as a Trustee for a *concept* related to an entity that does not exist, in a way that is
 25 not legally recognized. They do so by *vigilante acts under the color of law but in violation*
thereof, and without apparent legal standing or authority.

26 13) The Honorable Bruce Mills (Judge Mills) is, and for all times relevant herein has acted as
 27 a Judge of the Superior Court of Contra Costa. The evidence indicates that Deutsche attorneys
 28 duped Judge Mills into violating due process and federal authority, for which violations there is
 29 no sovereign immunity as supported by *Ex parte Young* 209 U.S. 123 (1908).

15) Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as
 1 DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names.
 2 Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.
 3
 16) Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all times herein
 4 mentioned, each of the defendants sued herein other than Judge Mills was the agent and
 5 employee of each of the remaining defendants and was at all relevant times acting within the
 6 purpose and scope of such agency and employment to exert rights they have not possessed,
 7 using means that are not supported by law, based upon agreements they have concealed, to attain
 maximum windfall profits from property about which they have no actual, legal, claim.
 8

9 **Synopsis of Pre-Petition Events Leading to Post Petition Damaging Acts**

10) In 2005 Peter Clark secured a debt to "Allstate" Lending with a deed of trust on his
 11 residence, office, and workshop at 1674 Pleasant Hill Road in Pleasant Hill, Contra Costa
 12 County, California ("Subject Premises"). One West Bank alleges that IndyMac Federal Bank,
 13 FSB, Pasadena, California received an assignment of both the Note and Deed of Trust from
 14 Allstate in 2005, however the evidence indicates that they had not received the Note at the time
 15 of an alleged foreclosure on said Note on October 22nd, 2009, when One West alleges that they
 16 foreclosed on said Note. Nor is there evidence that Indymac Loan Services' alleged successor in
 17 interest, Indymac Loan Services ("Indymac"), actually possessed the Note on November 10, 2009,
 18 when Deutsche Bank alleges that it took possession of the "Trustee's Deed" to the Subject
 19 Premises in a series of sleight-of-hand moves that are alleged to have violated laws that include
 the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act as part of Defendant's alleged fraud delineated in part
 herein. The Case law suggests that all of these alleged acts are void or voidable.
 20
 18) IndyMac Bank, F.S.B., Pasadena, CA failed, and on July 11, 2008, the Office of Thrift
 21 Supervision (OTS) closed it, and named the the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC)
 22 Conservator. On March 19, 2009, the FDIC completed the sale of IndyMac Federal Bank, FSB,
 23 Pasadena, California, to OneWest Bank, F.S.B., Pasadena, California. (www.fdic.gov › Industry
 Analysis › Failed Banks)
 24
 19) OneWest Bank then liquidated Indymac Bank and formed a successor company,
 25 Indymac Loan Services. From information and belief, this was accomplished to limit their

1 liability regarding previous acts, however it is alleged that in so doing they eliminated their
 2 alleged assets and the security thereto, including their ability to foreclose on Notes. This is
 3 because the evidence, and lack thereof, indicates that Indymac never legally transferred their
 4 Notes and/or Deeds of Trusts, including on the Subject Premises, prior to OneWest Bank
 5 liquidating Indymac Bank.

6 20) One West created a new entity, Indymac Loan Services. From information and belief,
 7 One West created Indymac Loan Services for the purpose of servicing allegedly outstanding
 8 Notes that do not, in fact, appear to be outstanding because the evidence indicates that Indymac
 9 Bank never legally transferred the Note or Deed of Trust to Indymac Loan Services prior to the
 10 liquidation. Indeed, is alleged that the reason why One West's attorneys did not document the
 11 transfer in a way that would make the debt collectable is because the transfer of the Notes to the
 12 new entity would have caused a taxable event proportional to the short term capital gain that
 13 resulted from their discounted purchase of the notes weeks before. Thus, it is alleged that to
 14 evade federal and State tax liabilities on their alleged liability evasion scheme, One West never
 15 legally transferred Indymac Bank's alleged Deeds of Trust to the new entity, Indymac Loan
 16 Services. It is thus alleged that Indymac Loan Services never actually possessed the Note on the
 17 Subject Property, and thus did not have the legal standing to foreclose on said Note.

18 21) Of possibly equal merit, however, is the fact that One West continued to make "false or
 19 misleading representations" (in violation of Title 15, Chapter 41 Subchapter V §1692) that
 20 Indymac Bank held the Note and Deed of Trust, and that is that name in which they allege that
 21 they provided notice of a foreclosure sale of the Subject Property, which Notice was allegedly
 22 never sent, as it was never received by the debtor or the Second deed holder (see the Declaration
 23 of Alan Kilpatrick, filed and attached herewith).

24 22) Deficient service of Notice is alleged to have additionally invalidated the alleged
 25 foreclosure that One West at first claimed as making the Subject Property "Real Estate Owned:
 of One West, but which Deutsche Bank later claimed was instead owned by Deutsche Bank as
 trustee for an alleged agreement that they have not put into evidence but which does not appear to
 constitute a trust, partnership, corporation, or anything that could hold legal title to property.

26 23) Instead, One West agents pretended to engage in loan modification while their "Default
 27 Escalation Specialists" schemed to facilitate foreclosure actions in secret. The secrecy was
 28

1 maintained, in part, by their failure of notice related to the alleged Notice to Vacate, which was
 2 also never received, and allegedly never sent.

3 24) The evidence indicates that other One West Attorneys foresaw the problem of Indymac
 4 Loan Services foreclosing on a Note that they had been alleging was held by Indymac Federal
 5 Bank, FSB, and as a result, brought in Deutsche Bank National Trust Company as an alleged
 6 "Innocent Buyer" in what is alleged to be a form of money laundering in violation of the Fair
 7 Credit Practices Act. This alleged transfer is alleged to have only compounded the alleged fraud,
 8 as is delineated further herein.

9 25) Plaintiff filed for Chapter 13 bankruptcy (reorganization) on February 10, 2010, and
 10 Deutsche filed an unlawful detainer action against Plaintiff less than one month later, on or about
 11 March 5th, in *prima facie* violation of the Automatic Bankruptcy Stay. Plaintiff stipulated to a
 12 lifting of the stay related to the Subject Property, however case law suggests that Plaintiff's doing
 13 so did not relieve Deutsche of liability related to their violations of stay, which Deutsche greatly
 14 compounded by engaging in numerous violations of the authority of the Bankruptcy Trustee and
 15 court, as delineated further below.

16 **Post Petition Violations of Federal Authority and Due Process**

17 26) On or about May 6th, 2010, Peter Clark's Chapter 13 reorganization was involuntarily
 18 converted to a Chapter 7 liquidation.¹ This act placed all of Mr. Clark's assets and pending
 19 lawsuits under the authority of the bankruptcy trustee by the authority of the Bankruptcy Act,
 20 requiring a stay for the change of attorney that prevented Mr. Clark from defending himself from
 21 the Deutsche's legal assaults and the Indymac Parties actions.²

22 ¹ The United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of California on Thursday, May 6, 2010 in *In re*
 23 Peter Carson Clark, Case No. 10-41422EJ, ruled to convert a bankruptcy proceeding initiated by Peter Clark on
 24 February 10, 2010 under Chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Code, to a Chapter 7 liquidation. Federal Judge Jellin
 25 signed the Order Converting Chapter 13 Case to a case under Chapter 7 on May 12, 2010.

26 ² Bankruptcy Code Section 541, Title 11 U.S.C. § 541, transfers Peter Clark's property to the trust estate. Section
 27 323 makes the Chapter 7 Trustee the estate's representative, including for purposes of litigation. Section 704 vests
 28 in the Trustee the sole authority to collect and liquidate the estate's property. In other words, conversion of the
 29 bankruptcy proceeding to a Chapter 7 liquidation removes Peter Clark as the Defendant and makes the Trust estate
 30 the Defendant instead. One of the immediate issues is the change in attorneys related to the case from Peter Clark to
 31 the attorney for the Trust estate. Due process would require a delay in any proceedings as a result of this change of
 32 attorneys alone. While the Bankruptcy Trustee has given notice that he would like to abandon the asset, in the
 33 current situation, the case exists in a netherworld in which the case is still in federal jurisdiction because the
 34 Bankruptcy Court has not yet ordered the Bankruptcy Trustee to abandon the asset, an action that by federal civil

1 26) Deutsche and the Indymac Parties both attempted to move forward with motions on over
 2 a dozen occasions before a half a dozen judges in the Contra Costa Superior Court related to the
 3 Subject Property in actions that were now under the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Trustee.
 4 However the evidence indicates that they did not serve the Trustee with the Motions, and have
 5 otherwise violated due process and the authority of the Trustee and/or the Trust Estate, as well as
 6 the right of Mr. Clark to have his "day in court" at a time when he was prevented by federal law
 7 from acting on his own behalf. As a result, Mr. Clark's case was never heard.

8 27) Deutsche's counsel then admitted to the court in Department 29 that it could not proceed
 9 because the asset, and the case, was under the authority of the Chapter 7 Bankruptcy Trustee and
 10 not the Debtor³. The order required of the bankruptcy judge is for the abandonment of the asset
by the case trustee, not of the removal of the "automatic" stay, which had already occurred.

11 28) Deutsche knew this, but attempted to confuse local judges by painting the issue as being a
 12 need to remove the automatic stay. Deutsche knew better because attorney Frank Ferris provided
 13 repeated Amicus Briefs which repeatedly informed them, and the courts, of the true issues related
 14 to the required order by the bankruptcy court for the Trustee to abandon the asset, including the
 15 cases related thereto, from the trust estate. Deutsche engaged in ex parte communication with
 16 Judge Mills, and scheduled a hearing without notice to the Trustee. Judge Mills is alleged to
 17 have violated federal authority and due process by granting Deutsche's Summary Judgment
 18 motion despite a lack of jurisdiction and despite innumerable triable issues of fact, in a
 19 hearing at which the Plaintiff was prevented by federal law from acting in his own defense.
 20 Judge Mills made his alleged ruling after repeated lobbying by the Deutsche attorneys and
 21 then collusion that constituted ex parte communications with the judge outside of the presence
 22 of opposing counsel. [See declaration of Alan Kilpatrick filed and attached herewith.] They
 23 cannot claim that their violation of Federal jurisdiction was innocent. A damages award
 24 against Defendants is thus required, as supported by extensive case law.

25

procedure would not take effect until 10 days after the order for the Indymac or Deutsche Parties to even schedule a hearing regarding the cases during this period thus violates federal authority and due process.

³ This is not the same thing as the automatic stay, which Mr. Clark had already stipulated to have lifted regarding the asset. The transfer of the cases to federal authority requires its own stay, however, if only because of the change in counsel. To proceed requires the bankruptcy trustee to agree to litigate, or the Bankruptcy Judge to make an order for the Trustee to release the action from the federal jurisdiction.

Deutsche Refuses to Meet & Confer RE: Abandonment of Asset by Trustee [11 USC §554]

29) Deutsche has no actual standing and thus the Contra Costa court has no jurisdiction, but proceeded anyway. There will continue to be a problem of due process and violations of federal authority preventing that court from moving forward with Deutsche's motions until the Bankruptcy Court orders the case trustee to abandon the asset under 11 USC §554. The debtor tried to Meet and Confer with the Movant to stipulate to an abandonment of the asset under 11 USC §554 and thus removal of the Subject Premises, and the associated cases, from federal jurisdiction, however the Movant has refused to cooperate. As a result, Mr. Clark is still in the process of getting the federal Court to abandon the asset in the absence of cooperation from the Movant. This does not relate to the "Automatic Stay" under 11 USC §362(a),

30) In keeping with these efforts, Peter Clark's then bankruptcy attorney, Lisa Edgar-Dickman, sent notice to all creditors of the intent of the debtor to request said Order for Trustee to Abandon Asset⁴. Peter Clark asked for a meet-and-confer regarding the matter, however the Deutsche and the Indymac Parties refused, and continue to refuse, to meet and confer regarding a stipulation for the Bankruptcy Court to order the case trustee to abandon the asset under 11 USC §554. Instead, Deutsche moved the Bankruptcy court for an order to lift the automatic stay under 11 USC §362(a), a request that was moot because there was no stay in place at the time.

An order lifting or modifying the automatic stay by itself does not constitute a de facto abandonment of the property of the estate. Procedures under § 554 must be followed before property is legally abandoned. *Catalano v. CIR*, 279 F.3d 682 (9th Cir. 2002)

31) Mr. Clark, attempted to meet an confer with the counsel for the Moving Party via e-mail twice to reach an agreement that would relieve the Contra Costa Court, and the Bankruptcy Court, of the burden of a hearing what was improperly scheduled in alleged contempt for Federal authority and in violation of due process, however opposing counsel refused to respond. The following is a transcript of the two messages, starting with the most recent, sent on August 5, 2010:

Peter Clark <peterclark@gmail.com>
to Amy Starrett Deutsch <astarrett@jandalegal.com>
date Aug 5, 2010 4:20 PM
subject Re: Meet and confer

⁴ The Notice was a “shout or die” notice that requires objectors to make their objections known or the asset will be abandoned.

1 date Aug 5, 2010 4:20 PM
1 subject Re: Meet and confer

2 Amy:

3 I am disappointed that you continue to fail to respond to my attempts to meet and confer with you.
3 I am further disappointed in your instead attempting to move forward with a motion before the
3 Bankruptcy Court to remove an alleged stay that did not exist, an act that greatly irritated the Judge.

4 As you are no doubt aware now, even if you were not previously, the proper action at this juncture
4 is the motion for the Court to compel the Trustee to abandon the asset that my (former) attorney, Lisa
5 Edgar Dickman, filed and mailed to all of the creditors on my behalf, and which you no doubt received
5 last month. In doing this, Mrs. Dickman and I are acting at the request of the attorney for the Chapter
7 Trustee.

6 Mrs. Dickman also sent an e-mail to me explaining how things must proceed prior to further
6 litigation between Deutsche Bank National Trust Company and myself, as follows:

7 "The motion to abandon I prepared was with a 21 days Notice and Opportunity of Hearing
8 known by BK attorney as a scream or die notice. Which means if someone objects you
8 must call Judge Jellen's clerk and set a court date, and if no one objects you submit the
order after 21 days- hence the scream or die nickname. So there is no court date scheduled

9 ...
9 The notice was sent to every single creditor and I used the court matrix list. (excerpted
10 from e-mail from Lisa Edgar Dickman to Peter Clark dated July 31, 2010).

11 Please note that the August 13th hearing date that your agents scheduled with Judge Mills in an ex
11 parte appearance before Judge Mills without notice to, and thus outside of the knowledge, much less
12 presence of opposing counsel, is also prior to the first time that I could reasonably expect the
12 Bankruptcy Court Judge (Jellen) to sign an order to abandon. As a result, the hearing scheduled for
13 August 13th must be removed from the calendar, and no new hearing date requested from the court
13 until, from my understanding of Federal Rules, 10 days AFTER the Bankruptcy Court Judge signs the
order.

14 Thus, please withdraw the hearing scheduled for August 13th from the calendar immediately so
14 that you do not place further unnecessary burdens on the court, or others that would be involved in
14 your further transparent attempts to violate due process.

15 Thank you in advance for your immediate attention to this matter.

15 Peter Clark

16 from Peter Clark <2peterclark@gmail.com>
16 to Amy Starrett Deutsche <astarrett@jandalegal.com>
17 date Jun 28, 2010 11:03 AM
17 subject Meet and confer

18 On 6/28/10, Peter Clark <2peterclark@gmail.com> wrote:

19 > Amy:
19 > I am concerned about your failure to follow legal procedure, including
19 > regarding the mandatory meet-and confer requirements of both Federal
20 > and State civil procedure. In particular, you have not responded to
20 > my meet-and-confer letter of June 24, 2010, and instead proceeded
21 > with the hearing on June 25 (with my being present solely as a
21 > witness). It was only after the recusal of two judges, three hours
21 > later on their own that your local counsel finally agreed that your
21 > attempting to move forward was in violation of federal law and
22 > California Civil Procedure.
22 > Your local counsel then suggested an approach which differs from what
22 > the attorney for the Chapter 7 told me was the steps that he proposed
23 > that I take, and which I do not believe to be viable for removing the
23 > action from the Chapter 7 Trust Estate. I thus request that you
24 > provide me with a copy of what you propose to file BEFORE you file it,
24 > thus complying with your meet-and-confer requirements.
25 > Also, please advise me of when you propose to take this action.

1 32) Instead, Deutsche moved the Bankruptcy court for an order to lift the automatic stay
 2 under 11 USC §362(a), a request that was moot because no stay was in place at the time.
 3

4 Deutsche knew this, and, it appears, they angered Bankruptcy Judge Jellin by burdening that
 5 court with unnecessary appearances that should have been settled by stipulation of the actual
 6 issue after a meet-and-confer.
 7

8 33) The Trustee agreed to abandon the asset in or about the end of July. In a hearing the
 9 Bankruptcy Judge offered to sign an order for the Trustee to abandon the asset, however the
 10 statutory 21-day period had not yet elapsed at the time. Before the 21-day period elapsed, two
 11 objections to the abandonment were filed with the court. The evidence indicates that Judge Jellin
 12 is required by public policy to sign a "comfort letter" related to the removal of stay, which Judge
 13 Jellin did, but the judge did not make the order to abandon the asset because of the objections
 14 by the other creditors. Because of those objections, and because of the failure of the Deutsche
 15 and the Indymac Parties to stipulate to the abandonment of the asset, and because the attorney
 16 for the bankruptcy Trustee did not file an agreement to abandon with the court (according to
 17 the Clerk), even though he agreed to abandon, Mr. Clark is now forced to schedule a hearing
 18 on the issue, which hearing has not yet been held. Part of the reason that Mr. Clark did not
 19 schedule the hearing yet is because, in the interests of justice, he needs to deal with said
 20 objecting alleged creditors, one at a time, to prevent them from further interference in the
 21 orderly administration of the trust estate. At least some aspects of the current (Adversary) case
 22 must now also be adjudicated prior to either of the other cases moving forward.
 23

24 34) Deutsche's counsel then engaged in ex parte communications with Judge Mills outside of
 25 the presence of the opposing counsel, Dennis Davis, attorney for the Trustee. Based upon the
 26 proofs of service, Dennis Davis was never properly served.
 27

28 35) In proceeding, Deutsche and Judge Mills violated Federal Authority of the Chapter 7
 29 Bankruptcy Trustee and due process in an action for which Deutsche had no standing and thus
 30 the Contra Costa Court had no actual jurisdiction, and for which there was numerous failures of
 31 notice, failure of due process, and a breach of justice (See *Amicus Brief of Frank Ferris*, filed
 32 and attached hereto as EXHIBIT E. Willful violations require sanctions, as will be shown.
 33 There is no sovereign immunity granted to state court judges who act under the color of law but
 34 in violation of Federal authority (the Bankruptcy Act), Due Process (14th Amendment), and thus
 35 civil rights as supported by *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908), and the clear intent of Congress

1 in enacting 42 U.S.C. §1983 to facilitate litigation as an exception to the federal anti-injunction
 2 statute, 28 U.S.C. § 2283 (cf. *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 91 S.Ct. 746, 27 L.Ed.2d 669).
 3

4 “It is clear from the legislative debates surrounding passage of § 1983’s predecessor that the Act was
 5 intended to enforce the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment ‘against State action, . . . whether that
 6 action be executive, legislative, or judicial.’ *Ex parte Virginia*, 100 U.S. 339, 346, 25 L.Ed. 676
 7 (emphasis supplied)- Justice Stewart for the Majority Opinion in *Mitchum v. Foster*, 407 U.S 225, 92
 8 S.Dt., 32 L.Ed.2d 705 (1972).

9 36) It is of further note that the action in question was for summary judgment, which
 10 requires that there be no “triable issues of fact” (California Rules of Court: Article 5, § 3.1350 et seq.,
 11 and California Code of Civil Procedure §437c). Yet Judge Mills gave the impression to observer Alan
 12 Kilpatrick that he was acting in collusion with the Deutsche attorney by prosecuting the case
 13 for him and ruling in the absence of opposing counsel, ordering summary judgment despite
 14 lack of jurisdiction, substantial defenses that Mr. Clark had previously pled, and the existence
 15 of considerable triable issues of fact (See EXHIBIT A, Peter Clark’s Undisputed Facts).
 16

17 “The function of the trial court in ruling on a motion for summary judgment is merely to determine
 18 whether such issues of fact exist, and not to decide the merits of the issues themselves. [Citation.]||
 19 (*Molko v. Holy Spirit Assn.* (1988) 46 Cal.3d 1092, 1107.) Page 1- A of transcript cited below.
 20 A. —A defendant or cross-defendant has met his or her burden of showing that a cause of action has no
 21 merit if that party has shown that one or more elements of the cause of action, even if not separately
 22 pleaded, cannot be established, or that there is a complete defense to that cause of action.|| (437c, subd.
 23 (p)(2).) [2010 State Bar of California 83rd ANNUAL MEETING Page 3- A of transcript of Program #80 “Summary Judgment:
 24 Recent Developments and the View From the Bench Friday, September 24, 2010 4:15 PM - 5:15 PM Sponsored by Litigation
 25 Section DEFENSE MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT Justice Rick Sims March, 2010 © 2010 by Rick Sims]

37) 37) Deficient Notice: Contrary to Deutsche Bank’s claim in their unlawful detainer Summary
 15 Judgment Motion against Mr. Clark, Mr. Clark denies that a notice to vacate was posted on the
 16 Property on 11/25/2009. Mr. Clark did not see the alleged posting, nor did the tenant. In addition,
 17 upon information and belief no notice to vacate was mailed to the Respondent nor to his tenant.
 18 Declarations of Mary Bauer and Peter Clark both state they never received notice. The notice
 19 attached as Defendant’s Exhibit B to their unlawful detainer only lists Mary Bauer, tenant, with
 20 an improper address, when Defendants knew the property was owner-occupied in a different
 21 address from the loan modification and from their ongoing communications.

22 38) As a result of the lack of service, Mr. Clark did not learn that Deutsche Bank alleged that
 23 they were the new owner of his home until after March 5, 2010, when Mr. Clark received a
 24 notification from the Contra Costa Courts that Deutsche Bank had filed an Unlawful Detainer
 25 case against him and his frail and elderly tenant in which Deutsche allege that they had provided
 26 notice 90 days before.

1 and a breach of justice. Willful violations require sanctions, and it appears that there is no
 2 sovereign immunity granted to judges.

38) It is of further note that the action in question was for summary judgment⁵, which
 3 requires that there be no “triable issues of fact.” Yet Judge Mills gave the impression to an
 4 observer that he was acting in collusion with the Deutsche attorney by acting in his place on
 5 behalf of the Deutsche attorney in ordering summary judgment despite lack of jurisdiction,
 6 substantial defenses that were pled, and the existence of considerable triable issues of fact.

7 “The function of the trial court in ruling on a motion for summary judgment is merely to determine
 8 whether such issues of fact exist, and not to decide the merits of the issues themselves. [Citation.]||
 9 (*Molko v. Holy Spirit Assn.* (1988) 46 Cal.3d 1092, 1107.) Page 1- A of transcript cited below.
 10 A. —A defendant or cross-defendant has met his or her burden of showing that a cause of action has no
 11 merit if that party has shown that one or more elements of the cause of action, even if not separately
 12 pleaded, cannot be established, or that there is a complete defense to that cause of action.|| (437c, subd.
 13 (p)(2).) [2010 State Bar of California 83rd ANNUAL MEETING Page 3- A of transcript of Program #80
 14 “Summary Judgment: Recent Developments and the View From the Bench Friday, September 24, 2010
 15 4:15 PM - 5:15 PM Sponsored by Litigation Section DEFENSE MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY
 16 JUDGMENT Justice Rick Sims March, 2010 © 2010 by Rick Sims]

17 39) Deficient Notice: Contrary to Deutsche Bank’s allegations in their unlawful detainer
 18 Summary Judgment Motion against Mr. Clark, Mr. Clark denies that a notice to vacate was
 19 posted on the property on 11/25/2009. Mr. Clark did not see the alleged posting, nor did the
 20 tenant. In addition, upon information and belief no notice to vacate was mailed to the
 21 Respondent nor to his tenant. Declarations of Mary Bauer and Peter Clark both state they never
 22 received notice. The notice attached as Defendant’s Exhibit B to their unlawful detainer only
 23 lists Mary Bauer, tenant, when Defendants knew the property was owner-occupied from the loan
 24 modification and from their ongoing communications. Said Defendant’s Notice did not list the
 25 proper address.

26 40) As a result of the lack of service, Mr. Clark did not learn that Deutsche Bank alleged that
 27 they were the new owner of his home until after March 5, 2010, when Mr. Clark received a
 28 notification from the Contra Costa Courts that Deutsche Bank had filed an Unlawful Detainer
 29 case against him and his frail and elderly tenant in which Deutsche allege that they had provided
 30 notice 90 days before.

31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 8010
 8011
 8012
 8013
 8014
 8015
 8016
 8017
 8018
 8019
 8020
 8021
 8022
 8023
 8024
 8025
 8026
 8027
 8028
 8029
 8030
 8031
 8032
 8033
 8034
 8035
 8036
 8037
 8038
 8039
 8040
 8041
 8042
 8043
 8044
 8045
 8046
 8047
 8048
 8049
 8050
 8051
 8052
 8053
 8054
 8055
 8056
 8057
 8058
 8059
 8060
 8061
 8062
 8063
 8064
 8065
 8066
 8067
 8068
 8069
 8070
 8071
 8072
 8073
 8074
 8075
 8076
 8077
 8078
 8079
 8080
 8081
 8082
 8083
 8084
 8085
 8086
 8087
 8088
 8089
 8090
 8091
 8092
 8093
 8094
 8095
 8096
 8097
 8098
 8099
 80100
 80101
 80102
 80103
 80104
 80105
 80106
 80107
 80108
 80109
 80110
 80111
 80112
 80113
 80114
 80115
 80116
 80117
 80118
 80119
 80120
 80121
 80122
 80123
 80124
 80125
 80126
 80127
 80128
 80129
 80130
 80131
 80132
 80133
 80134
 80135
 80136
 80137
 80138
 80139
 80140
 80141
 80142
 80143
 80144
 80145
 80146
 80147
 80148
 80149
 80150
 80151
 80152
 80153
 80154
 80155
 80156
 80157
 80158
 80159
 80160
 80161
 80162
 80163
 80164
 80165
 80166
 80167
 80168
 80169
 80170
 80171
 80172
 80173
 80174
 80175
 80176
 80177
 80178
 80179
 80180
 80181
 80182
 80183
 80184
 80185
 80186
 80187
 80188
 80189
 80190
 80191
 80192
 80193
 80194
 80195
 80196
 80197
 80198
 80199
 80200
 80201
 80202
 80203
 80204
 80205
 80206
 80207
 80208
 80209
 80210
 80211
 80212
 80213
 80214
 80215
 80216
 80217
 80218
 80219
 80220
 80221
 80222
 80223
 80224
 80225
 80226
 80227
 80228
 80229
 80230
 80231
 80232
 80233
 80234
 80235
 80236
 80237
 80238
 80239
 80240
 80241
 80242
 80243
 80244
 80245
 80246
 80247
 80248
 80249
 80250
 80251
 80252
 80253
 80254
 80255
 80256
 80257
 80258
 80259
 80260
 80261
 80262
 80263
 80264
 80265
 80266
 80267
 80268
 80269
 80270
 80271
 80272
 80273
 80274
 80275
 80276
 80277
 80278
 80279
 80280
 80281
 80282
 80283
 80284
 80285
 80286
 80287
 80288
 80289
 80290
 80291
 80292
 80293
 80294
 80295
 80296
 80297
 80298
 80299
 80300
 80301
 80302
 80303
 80304
 80305
 80306
 80307
 80308
 80309
 80310
 80311
 80312
 80313
 80314
 80315
 80316
 80317
 80318
 80319
 80320
 80321
 80322
 80323
 80324
 80325
 80326
 80327
 80328
 80329
 80330
 80331
 80332
 80333
 80334
 80335
 80336
 80337
 80338
 80339
 80340
 80341
 80342
 80343
 80344
 80345
 80346
 80347
 80348
 80349
 80350
 80351
 80352
 80353
 80354
 80355
 80356
 80357
 80358
 80359
 80360
 80361
 80362
 80363
 80364
 80365
 80366
 80367
 80368
 80369
 80370
 80371
 80372
 80373
 80374
 80375
 80376
 80377
 80378
 80379
 80380
 80381
 80382
 80383
 80384
 80385
 80386
 80387
 80388
 80389
 80390
 80391
 80392
 80393
 80394
 80395
 80396
 80397
 80398
 80399
 80400
 80401
 80402
 80403
 80404
 80405
 80406
 80407
 80408
 80409
 80410
 80411
 80412
 80413
 80414
 80415
 80416
 80417
 80418
 80419
 80420
 80421
 80422
 80423
 80424
 80425
 80426
 80427
 80428
 80429
 80430
 80431
 80432
 80433
 80434
 80435
 80436
 80437
 80438
 80439
 80440
 80441
 80442
 80443
 80444
 80445
 80446
 80447
 80448
 80449
 80450
 80451
 80452
 80453
 80454
 80455
 80456
 80457
 80458
 80459
 80460
 80461
 80462
 80463
 80464
 80465
 80466
 80467
 80468
 80469
 80470
 80471
 80472
 80473
 80474
 80475
 80476
 80477
 80478
 80479
 80480
 80481
 80482
 80483
 80484
 80485
 80486
 80487
 80488
 80489
 80490
 80491
 80492
 80493
 80494
 80495
 80496
 80497
 80498
 80499
 80500
 80501
 80502
 80503
 80504
 80505
 80506
 80507
 80508
 80509
 80510
 80511
 80512
 80513
 80514
 80515
 80516
 80517
 80518
 80519
 80520
 80521
 80522
 80523
 80524
 80525
 80526
 80527
 80528
 80529
 80530
 80531
 80532
 80533
 80534
 80535
 80536
 80537
 80538
 80539
 80540
 80541
 80542
 80543
 80544
 80545
 80546
 80547
 80548
 80549
 80550
 80551
 80552
 80553
 80554
 80555
 80556
 80557
 80558
 80559
 80560
 80561
 80562
 80563
 80564
 80565
 80566
 80567
 80568
 80569

1 41) Deutsche's response to Mr. Clark's Answer completely mischaracterized Mr. Clark's
 2 Defense and failed to even mention, much less address, the vast majority of the triable issues of
 3 fact that Mr. Clark listed, or the reasons why that court does not have in personam jurisdiction
 4 or jurisdiction to render the verdict that Deutsche seeks. In so doing, Deutsche tacitly admits to
 5 the existence of those triable issues of fact and lack of in personam jurisdiction or jurisdiction
 6 to render the verdict that Plaintiff seeks. In addition, Plaintiff has not addressed and thus tacitly
 7 admits to the numerous adverse rulings by other courts of competent jurisdiction against
 8 Deutsche on the same issue of standing that Mr. Clark brought forward as a defense to the
 9 Summary Judgment Motion. Deutsche spent most of its argument (the first 11 pages), trying to
 10 un-ring the bell of rulings adverse Deutsche regarding standing by arguing Quiet Title issues
 11 that the unlawful detainer court lacks jurisdiction to decide, and whose primary issue (of
 12 standing) has been decided against Deutsche in said numerous referenced cases. As such,
 13 Deutsche has tacitly admitted that the primary issues of fact related to the current ownership of
 14 the Subject Property have already been adjudicated adverse to Deutsche Bank, and thus
 15 Deutsche Bank is estopped from arguing these issues again.

16 42) In short, Deutsche lost sight of the fact that they brought forward a motion for Summary
 17 Judgment in an Unlawful Detainer case where they have the burden of proof to show that they
 18 have in personam standing; that the Contra Costa court has jurisdiction to render the verdict
 19 that Deutsche Bank seeks; and that Deutsche has meticulously adhered to all of the notice and
 20 other due process requirements, none of which are true in this case, and other issues that
 21 preclude a ruling in summary judgment. By ignoring these serious and consistent violations of
 22 notice, law, and other violations of due process that they had to adhere to for them to prevail in
 23 an Unlawful Detainer case, they tacitly admit to said violations, and cannot prevail for this
 24 reason as well.

25 43) As a convenience to Deutsche, Peter Clark provided Deutsche with MS Word '97
 26 compatible versions of Defendant's Answer and Defendant's Statement of Undisputed Facts
 27 prior to the first hearing of that case (after faxing the document) in keeping with the notice
 28 requirements of unlawful detainer summary judgment. Mr. Clark did this, in part, to make it
 29 easy for Deutsche to address the issues brought forward by Defendants, point-by-point, in the
 30 accelerated time frames of an unlawful detainer summary judgment action. Mr. Clark asked
 31 that Deutsche return the favor, again, in part, to allow the issues to be addressed point-by-

1 point. Deutsche failed to do so, apparently because it had no answers to most of Defendants' points, on the apparent hope that by arguing the Quiet Title case in that court rather than the unlawful detainer, that the unlawful detainer Court would be wowed by Deutsche's international stature and thereby ignore their violations of law such as 15 USC 1962e] (12) *The false representation or implication that accounts have been turned over to innocent purchasers for value.* To use the state courts, Deutsche Bank must comply with both Federal law and state law in the way that Defendants show that Wells Fargo Bank N.A. has.

2
3
4
5
6 44) There were thus considerable triable issues of fact, however Mr. Clark could not act for
7 his own defense during the time of the hearing, and thus sent an observer, Alan Kilpatrick, as
8 a witness to the events. Mr. Kilpatrick provided a declaration, which is filed and attached
9 herewith (declaration of Alan Kilpatrick). Said declaration describes what Mr. Kilpatrick
10 describes as "collusion" during the ex parte communications outside of the presence of
11 opposing counsel during deliberations in which the judge did not consider the existence of the
12 substantial triable issues of fact and substantial defenses in Mr. Clark's ANSWER. Mr. Clark
13 has no recourse in the California Courts because of the continued Federal jurisdiction.

14 BACKGROUND

15 45) Without actual standing to do so and without proper notice, Defendant Deutsche Bank
16 National Trust Company, which is alleged to not be a corporation or any entity that has rights
17 under Federal or State Law, alleges that they engaged in a foreclosure action on October 20 or
18 November 10, 2009, by an alleged foreclosure mill process that is alleged to be in violation of both
19 Federal and State law regarding the "Subject Premises" at 1674 Pleasant Hill Rd., Pleasant Hill,
CA 94523 (units "A" and "B") herein also the "Subject Property."

20 46) The One West Parties had been engaged in a process of alleged fraudulent misrepresentation
21 that culminated in their keeping secret from Plaintiff Deutsche's identity as the alleged
22 foreclosing entity until Deutsche filed an unlawful detainer action on or about March 5, 2010
23 against Plaintiff and his elderly tenant, Mary Bauer (Ms. Bauer), to evict Plaintiff and Ms. Bauer
24 from their homes.

25 47) Deutsche's actions to acquire alleged title are void for lack of standing and by collateral
estoppels as mentioned previously and delineated below (*In Re Foreclosure Cases*," 521 F.

1 Supp. 2d 650, 653 (S.D. Oh. 2007 and *In re Kang Jin Hwang*, 396 B.R. 757 (Bankr.C.D.Cal.
 2 2008). A Quiet Title action is thus required per California Code of Civil Procedure Sections
 3 760.10-760.060.

4 48) The evidence indicates that the fraud and other violations of law delineated herein are typical
 5 of a massive fraud that Defendants are perpetrating against homeowners across the United States.
 6 49) One of the allegedly illegal methods that Defendants used in the current case is a previously
 7 secret “bait-and-switch” of ownership interests to provide the illusion that Deutsche is an
 8 innocent buyer of the Note and/or Deed of Trust on the Subject Property. This act additionally
 9 violates the letter and intent of 15 USC 1962e] (12) *The false representation or implication that*
 10 *accounts have been turned over to innocent purchasers for value.* (Fair Debt Collection Practices
 11 Act, Title VIII, 807). Defendants kept this concealed by several further violations of notice
 12 requirements that would have had to have been met for legal transfer of the ownership, as well as
 13 for their subsequent unlawful detainer action.
 14 50) In this way, Defendants have attempted to exact windfall profits by violations of law in areas
 15 where they have enjoyed immunity from the legal consequences until 2007. Deutsche and One
 16 West both got away with said violations of law and due process in acts that are alleged to fit the
 17 legal description of extortion and money laundering as delineated further herein. State and
 18 Federal Judges started to intervene in 2007, however, as delineated further herein.
 19 51) The money laundering alone is alleged to void the note and deed of trust.

20 **Further Violations of Law**

21 52) In 2007, Deutsche attempted to reduce costs for their eviction mill process by foreclosing on
 22 and evicting fourteen of their clients at the same time in Federal District Court in Cleveland Ohio
 23 (“*In Re Foreclosure Cases*,” 521 F. Supp. 2d 650, 653 (S.D. Oh. 2007). In that case, US Federal
 24 Judge, C.A. Boyko saw the consistent pattern of violations of law in all cases. As a result, Judge
 25 Boyko ruled to dismiss the claims by Deutsche Bank National Trust Company to take possession
 of any of the 14 homes for lack of standing. Knowing this, Defendants are alleged to have
 engaged in an agency relationship to provide the illusion of a bona fide third party purchaser of
 Notes and Deed of Trust in general, and on Plaintiff’s home of thirty years specifically, at a time
 when banks are known to not be buying the notes of other banks.

1 53) Defendant's actions additionally invalidates the title that Deutsche claims on the subject
 2 property because the Notice provided by Defendants listed Indymac, and not Deutsche Bank as
 3 the foreclosing note holder, yet Deutsche Bank now claims that they were the foreclosing note
 4 holder, thus rendering the Notice void, additionally invalidating the foreclosure. In fact, the
 5 evidence indicates that neither Deutsche Bank nor Indymac actually held the Note or Deed of
 6 Trust at the time, while state and federal law require that, "[t]o show standing in a foreclosure
 7 action, . . . the plaintiff must show that it is the holder of the note and the mortgage at the time . . ."
 8 (*In Re Foreclosure Cases*," 521 F. Supp. 2d 650, 653 (S.D. Oh. 2007).

9 54) The evidence indicates that Defendant Deutsche is not a bona fide buyer of the Note and
 10 Deed of Trust on the Subject Property in any capacity; did not follow legal procedures in an
 11 alleged assignment of a deed of trust or in foreclosing; and did not actually possess the right to
 12 foreclose. Nor did the Trustee comply with "*all applicable statutory requirements of the State of*
 13 *California (or) perform all duties required by the Deed of Trust (by) sending a Notice of Default*
 14 *and Election to Sell within ten days after its recording and a Notice of Sale...in compliance with*
 15 *California Civil Code 2924(b)* as Deutsche Bank alleges in their unlawful detainer action to evict
 16 Plaintiff and his frail and elderly tenant from their home. The alleged foreclosure action is thus
 17 further void as a result of this additional violation of due process.

18 55) **Deficient Service:** Contrary to Deutsche Bank's allegations in their unlawful detainer, the
 19 trustee for the Deed of Trust did not provide the required Notice of Sale {See declaration of Alan
 20 Kilpatrick, filed and attached herewith), nor was Mr. Clark. In addition, Mr. Clark was NOT
 21 served with Notice to Quit (nor was his tenant, Mary Bauer, as shown by their declarations.⁶

22 56) **No actual standing for unlawful detainer:** Deutsche is not a Corporation or an entity
 23 that has filed a fictitious name statement and thus they cannot "*maintain any action... in any*
 24 *court*" by Bus. & Prof. Code ¶¶17915-17918. Deutsche thus has no actual rights to sue or move
 25 forward "any action in any court" in California. Nor is the non-entity agreement with a liquidated
 26 former entity for which they allege to be Trustee, and their actions with agents is alleged to
 27 violate both Federal banking laws and State laws:

28
 29 ⁶ Mr. Clark did not learn that Deutsche Bank alleged that they were the new owner of his home until after March 5,
 30 2010, when Mr. Clark received a notification from the Contra Costa Courts that Deutsche Bank had filed an Unlawful
 31 Detainer case against him and his frail and elderly tenant in which Deutsche allege that they had provided notice 90
 32 days before.

1 57) Deutsche argues that they are exempt from state laws by their federal charter, however
 2 this is simply not the case. To the contrary. Federal Charter Banks are required to act as if they
 3 are state chartered banks and otherwise comply with all requirements to do business in a state
 4 which would include filing a Fictitious Name business statement. States are prohibited from
 5 adding any additional requirements to a federal charter bank that are not required of a state
 6 charter bank. In addition, the Office of the Comptroller of Currency has not approved Deutsche
 7 operating in Contra Costa County.

8 58) Because Deutsche Bank is not licensed in California or filed a fictitious business name
 9 statement, they cannot “*maintain any action... in any court*” by Bus. & Prof. Code ¶17915-
 10 17918. However Deutsche is also not a corporation or other entity that has rights, and cannot
 11 legally prevail in their suit for unlawful detainer for this reason as well. Deutsche argues that
 12 these issues cannot be considered in an unlawful detainer case, however case law supports Mr.
 13 Clark’s position that the question of jurisdiction is always a matter that must be considered, and
 14 that any judgment rendered without jurisdiction by a court is void.

15 59) Deutsche would like that none of this be considered prior to an unlawful detainer action, in
 16 which they allege that the law assumes that their actions are without fault because they say so.

17 60) At the time that Defendants now allege that Deutsche foreclosed on Plaintiff’s home,
 18 Indymac Loan Services and “One West Bank” were alleging that Indymac /One West Bank took
 19 ownership of the Subject Property as “Real Estate Owned (REO)” by Indymac/One West Bank
 20 on October 20, 2009, as shown by the last paragraph of the EXHIBIT B letter that Mr. Clark
 21 received dated November 17. 2009 (one month after Defendants now allege that Deutsche Bank
 22 took the property in foreclosure. Both of Defendant’s stories cannot be true, and thus one must be
 23 false. By the legal principle of “false in one, false in all, (Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus), the
 24 entire house of cards of these alleged transactions must be ruled to be fraudulent, as, indeed, it
 25 has been for Deutsche and Indymac on numerous occasions across this country since 2007.

61) From information and belief, Deutsche violated numerous Federal and State laws in
 62 bringing forward their action against Mr. Clark without apparent standing:

63) 62) Indymac has alleged that in 2005 it bought the Note and Deed of Trust on the subject
 64 property, which it continued to claim to hold as late as June 9, 2010. There is no indication that
 65 there was a legal transfer of both the Note and Deed of Trust from the original lender, Allstate.
 66 In addition, Indymac was liquidated in 2008, and there is no indication that there was a transfer

of both the Note and Deed of Trust prior to Indymac being liquidated. Indymac pretended to engage in loan modification in its name through most of 2009 (until November 17th, one month AFTER One West alleged that they foreclosed on the Subject premises, and two weeks after Deutsche claims that they took Ownership of the Subject Property in place of Indymac by a process that itself appears to have violated federal and state laws.

62) Indymac has represented for years that it was they, and not Deutsche Bank, who held the Note, including as verified by the November 17, 2009 letter from Indymac/one West to Peter Clark, a copy of which Mr. Clark supplied as his EXHIBIT A to his Answer in the Unlawful Detainer. (Both Peter Clark and the holders of the Second Deed of Trust, Alan Kilpatrick and Jo Ann Kilpatrick, both deny receiving Deutsche's EXHIBIT "D" alleged NOTICE OF TRUSTEE'S SALE, thus invalidating the sale for the additional reason of failure of notice).

63) The evidence indicates that One West, realizing that Indymac could not legally act after it was liquidated, brought in Deutsche Bank as an alleged innocent buyer of the subject property in apparent direct violation of the letter and intent of the *Fair Debt Collection Practices Act* Title VIII, 807). (15 USC 1962e] (12) *The false representation or implication that accounts have been turned over to innocent purchasers for value.* The fact of their false pretense is verified by the alleged “Trustee’s Deed Upon Sale” (Plaintiff’s EXHIBIT A to Deutsche’s Summary Judgment Motion), which states as its first statement “***The grantee herein (Deutsche) IS the foreclosing beneficiary.***”

64) The alleged title-holder (per an alleged Trustee's Deed) is "Deutsche Bank National Trust Company as Trustee for" ...an agreement with a company that no longer exists. Yet Deutsche as Trustee has not placed into evidence the agreement that they allege owns the asset, or any documents related thereto. As previously delineated, Deutsche is claiming title for an agreement with a liquidated entity in a way not legally recognized in California.

65) Deutsche has not filed a fictitious name statement, and thus cannot move forward, and is also not the real party in interest pursuant to Rule 17 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as supported by *In re Kang Jin Hwang*, 396 B.R. 757 (Bankr.C.D.Cal., 2008), A joinder with the actual owner is required by Rule 19 (ibid.), and *In re Kang Jin Hwang* would give rise to uncertainty about who that owner is even without the uncertainty about the non-existent Trust or the questionable legal status of Deutsche as Trustee for an entity that

1 does not appear to exist, Deutsche as Trustee is also prevented by collateral estoppels from
 2 moving this court for lack of standing in Debtor's Bankruptcy per *In Re Foreclosure Cases*,"
 3 521 F. Supp. 2d 650, 653 (S.D. Oh. 2007).

4 66) With *In Re Foreclosure Cases*, Federal District Court Judge Boyko overturned
 5 fourteen of fourteen attempted foreclosures and evictions attempted by Deutsche Bank
 6 National Trust Company for lack of standing under a condition substantially identical to one
 7 of the conditions present in the current case regarding Deutsche as Trustee's
 8 misrepresentations of evidence as part of an alleged massive fraud against actual American
 9 citizens who have actual protections by the United States Constitution (which Deutsche
 10 allegedly does not).

11 **Bad Faith Deception, Fraud, and 15 USC 1962e] (12) Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Title VIII, 807**

12 67) Indymac Party Defendants are alleged to have prefaced Deutsche's fraud with bad faith
 13 Pre-Petition deceptive business practices that violated the covenant of good faith and fair
 14 dealings in an agency relationship with each other to gain windfall profits from their violation of
 15 legal procedures in violation of the Fair Credit Practices Act, the Business & Professions Code
 16 §17200 , and other violations of alleging to foreclose on Plaintiff's home and now to take
 17 possession without apparent actual standing and/or other fraud, and in an agency relationship
 18 with Deutsche Bank to rid the property of the 30 year resident and his frail and elderly tenant.
 19 The evidence indicates that this Post-Petition claim constitutes another violation:

20 15 USC 1962e] (12) *The false representation or implication that accounts have been turned over*
 21 *to innocent purchasers for value.* (Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Title VIII, 807).

22 68) Plaintiff did not know of the ruse until Plaintiff received a notification from the Contra
 23 Costa Courts that Deutsche Bank had filed an Unlawful Detainer case against Plaintiff and the
 24 tenant of Unit "B," Mary Bower, Case # CD10-0170 in or about March 5, 2010, three weeks
 25 after Mr. Clark filed for bankruptcy protection. Deutsche has violated Federal authority so their
 unlawful detainer action will be heard prior to the issue of their (lack of) standing is heard.

69) The evidence indicates that Deutsche did not possess the underlying Note and/or trust
 20 agreement giving authority for Deutsche to act on their own behalf or on behalf of Indymac to
 21 foreclose on the real property commonly known as 1674 Pleasant Hill Rd., Pleasant Hill, CA
 22 94523 (herein "Subject Property), or for Indymac/ OneWest or Quality Loan Services to act at
 23
 24
 25

1 all. In addition, there are major issues regarding the underlying alleged foreclosure(s) and events
 2 surrounding said alleged foreclosure(s) alleged on October 20, 2009 AND November 10, 2009.
 3 Both are not possible, so at least one must be fraudulent.

4 70) The evidence indicates that Defendants are not the legal owners of the subject property:

5 "For an assignment to be valid there must be more than the assignment of the deed alone; the note must
 6 also be assigned See *Carpenter v. Logan*, 83 U.S. 271, 274 (1872) stating that the note and mortgage are
 7 inseparable; the former as essential, the later incident adding that an assignment of the note carries the
 8 mortgage with it" as quoted from *Saxon Mortgage Services, Inc vs Ruthie B. Hillary et al* Case No.C-08-
 9 4357 document 19. ————— *In re Leisure Time Sports, Inc.* 194 B.R. 859, 861 (9th Circuit 1996)

10 71) Thus, it is the assignment of the note that carries the mortgage with it. Plaintiff demands
 11 strict proof that Defendants possessed and were properly assigned the Note at those times,

12 72) In 2008, U.S. Federal Judge, C.A. Boyko in Federal District Court in Cleveland Ohio
 13 ruled to dismiss a claim by Deutsche Bank National Trust Company seeking to take possession
 14 of 14 homes from Cleveland residents living in them, in order to claim the assets (" *In Re
 15 Foreclosure Cases*," 521 F. Supp. 2d 650, 653 (S.D. Oh. 2007) (stating that, "[t]o show
 16 standing in a foreclosure action, . . . the plaintiff must show that it is the holder of the note and
 17 the mortgage at the time the complaint was filed..."). This ruling has been echoed all over the
 18 country, and Defendants are precluded by estopples from prevailing today.

19 73) On October 22, Indymac insisted that they had foreclosed and taken the property for
 20 themselves on October 20, 2009, per Indymac's agents, in response to calls by Plaintiff, and as
 21 late as their letter to Plaintiff dated November 17, 2009 (filed and attached as EXHIBIT "B"), one
 22 week AFTER what Defendants are now alleging as the date of a foreclosure sale to Deutsche
 23 Bank on November 10, 2009, per Deutsche Bank's current story. Plaintiff relied on the veracity
 24 of Indymac's story, which they now state was false, and Plaintiff was damaged as a result. Once
 25 again, Indymac fraudulently induced Plaintiff to remain out of Bankruptcy, possibly so they
 could arrange their paperwork. Thus, even if they did have the proper paperwork for the
 foreclosure, which is denied, said alleged foreclosure would have still been the product of fraud.

22 **Issues Of Law Re Lack Of Standing And Violations Of Due Process**

23 74) Plaintiff states upon information and belief that Defendants lack standing to foreclose or
 24 to bring their unlawful detainer action against Plaintiff. Plaintiff believed that Indymac/ One
 25 West Bank was the foreclosing lien holder, an allegation that Indymac alleged as late as their

1 November 17 letter to Plaintiff (EXHIBIT B), three weeks after they alleged they foreclosed on
 2 Plaintiff's Property on October 20, 2009. This is one week after Defendants now allege
 3 Plaintiff's property was foreclosed on November 10, 2009, as reflected by the alleged Trustee's
 4 Deed Upon Sale issued by Quality Loan Service Corporation to Deutsche Bank National Trust
 5 Company as Trustee for Indymac, and not as the new owner, as Defendants now allege. At least
 6 one of their allegations must be false. According to the legal principle of "False in One, False in
 7 All" (Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus), all of Defendants' story must be held to be false.

8 **Declaratory Relief Required**

9 75) An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between Plaintiff and Deutsche
 10 concerning their respective rights and concerning the ownership of the Subject Property and the
 11 legality of the business practices of Defendants during this time of economic emergency⁷.

12 76) The evidence indicates that Defendants Indymac and Deutsche Bank have lost lawsuits
 13 filed against them for lack of standing to engage in foreclosure proceedings without possessing
 14 the original Note and Deed of Trust, and/or other violations of law. Said lawsuit losses have
 15 included a federal action known as "*In Re Foreclosure Cases*," 521 F. Supp. 2d 650, 653 (S.D.
 16 Oh. 2007) (in which a federal judge ruled against Deutsche in fourteen foreclosures and evictions
 17 were only their lack of standing was at issue, providing the foundation for collateral estoppels in
this case fourteen times. In that case, the Federal Judge opined that, "[t]o show standing in a
 18 foreclosure action, . . . the plaintiff must show that it is the holder of the note and the mortgage at
the time the complaint was filed..."

19 77) A security interest cannot exist independent from the obligation that it secures. *In Re*
 20 *Leisure Time Sports, Inc.*, 194 B.R. 859, 861 (9th Cir. Bap 1996) A security interest cannot exist,
 21 much less be transferred, independent from the obligation which it secures. *In re DiSanto &*
22 Moore Associates, Inc., 41 B.R. 935, 938 (C.D.Cal. 1984); *Union Supply Co. v. Morris*, 220 Cal.
 23 331, 338-39, 30 P.2d 394, 397 (1934). The security interest follows the debt. Id. If the debt is not

24 7 The California Legislature recognized the economic emergency by their enactment of HR ABX 27 (The Foreclosure
 25 Prevention Act); and SB 1137, codified as California Civil Code 2923.5 and 2923.6. The high rate of foreclosures is
 causing unprecedented disruptions to the public, and to the real estate industry of which Defendants are a part. It is the
 clear intent of the California Legislature and the Governor that mortgage lenders pursue loan modification programs in
 good faith in the State of California, and thus minimize the threat to the state and local economies due to skyrocketing
 foreclosures. A similar intent has been expressed on a Federal level by the Obama Administration.

1 transferred, neither is the security interest. Id. The note and mortgage are inseparable; the former
 2 as essential, the latter as an incident. An assignment of the note carries the mortgage with it, while
 3 an assignment of the latter alone is a nullity. *Carpenter v. Longan*, 83 U.S. 271 (1872). It is well
 4 established that a plaintiff must prove standing by showing: (1) injury in fact; (2) a causal
 5 connection between the injury and the defendant's conduct; and (3) a likelihood that a favorable
 6 outcome will redress the injury. See *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992).

78) *In Re Foreclosure Cases*," was heard in Federal District Court in Cleveland Ohio. In
 7 that case, US Federal Judge, C.A. Boyko ruled to dismiss a claim by Deutsche Bank National
 8 Trust Company to take possession of 14 homes. Knowing this, One West is alleged to have
 9 engaged in an agency relationship with Deutsche to provide the illusion of a bona fide third party
 10 purchaser of the Notes and Deed of Trust on Plaintiff's home of thirty years at a time of
 11 economic disruption of such unprecedented proportion that banks are known to not be buying the
 12 notes of other banks. Indeed, American Banks were being tightly controlled to insure that they
 13 would not pick up more junk paper. This explains why One West went to Deutsche to complete
 14 their fraud. It does NOT explain how Deutsche was able to do this while receiving \$6 Billion
 15 dollars in TARP money despite the contrary intent of Congress.

16) Deutsche has shown no ACTUAL evidence that Indymac ever received the underlying
 17 promissory note in the first place. Deutsche has shown no ACTUAL evidence that Indymac ever
 18 provided such Note to Deutsche Bank, much less provided it prior to OneWest dissolving
 19 Indymac. Indeed, if Deutsche provided such evidence it would only underscore their conspiracy to
 20 engage in false and deceptive business practices for years. In fact, the evidence seems to show that
 21 Deutsche has never had a de jure interest in the Subject Property and no standing to evict Plaintiff.

22) Further, Deutsche is not a corporation which would have actual rights as interpreted by the
 23 Supreme Court to the U.S. Constitution (such as the right to hold title to property or to avail
 24 themselves of the courts), and has not shown any evidence that they have any actual rights under
 25 State law, which requires them to file a fictitious name statement. Thus, it appears that Deutsche is
 an outlaw foreign money pool that received \$6 Billion dollars in stimulus money despite the intent
 of Congress that such money should only go to American corporations, all while, the evidence
 suggests, evading U.S. taxes. *In Re Foreclosure Cases* shows that Deutsche had no right to
 foreclose or evict, and *In re Kang Jin Hwang*, 396 B.R. 757 (Bankr.C.D.Cal. 2008) shows that

1 Deutsche would be without standing even IF they were a corporation that paid taxes and
 2 adhered to the requirements of the State of California for doing business in this state (including
 3 filing a fictitious name statement). No other Federal Charter Bank (such as Wells Fargo)
 4 alleges that their Federal Charter exempts them from such requirements, and such an assertion
 5 of Federal authority into the business of the State would have violated the 11th Amendment,
 6 something the State of California would never have allowed.

7 81) However, the Plaintiff would be injured if their unlawful detainer action were granted
 8 because Deutsche seeks to evict Plaintiff from his home, office, and workshop at a time of
 9 tremendous economic disruption caused by Deutsche and their ilk by these and similar violations
 10 of law. Instead, Mr. Clark needs to re-organize his business affairs after being driven into the
 11 current bankruptcy by a massive fraud in the tens of millions of dollars by officers of this court,
 12 the law offices and attorneys of Wendel, Rosen, Black and Dean, (Wendel).⁸

13 82) To show that they have actual standing to proceed with their unlawful detainer action,
 14 Deutsche must demonstrate that Deutsche:

15 a. is a legal entity, with rights, and
 16 b. held the deed of trust and promissory note at the time of the alleged foreclosure.

17 83) If Deutsche cannot show these things, it has no injury in fact. See *In re Foreclosure*
 18 *Cases*, 521 F. Supp. 2d 650, 653 (S.D. Oh. 2007) (stating that, "[t]o show standing in a foreclosure
 19 action, . . . the plaintiff must show that it is the holder of the note and the mortgage at the time the
 20 complaint was filed [and] . . . that the holder of the note and mortgage is harmed, usually by not
 21 having received payments on the note").

22 84) Deutsche almost certainly did not have legal possession of the Note at the time of the
 23 alleged foreclosure. Indymac FSB was the legal foreclosing entity, but they did not exist at the
 24 time of the foreclosure. Instead, OneWest Bank/Indymac Loan Services alleged that they
 25 foreclosed as late as November 17, 2009, one week after the November 10, 2009 date that
 Deutsche now claims in their post-petition allegations (in their unlawful detainer filing that

23
 24
 25 ⁸ Wendel directly violated their contract with Peter Clark and Bar Rules by drafting and filing an avalanche of
 litigation against their client in the name of entities of which their client was, and alleges is, the highest authority, for
 the stated goal of "bankrupting Peter Clark," and then caused the conversion of Plaintiff's Chapter 13 reorganization to
 a Chapter 7 liquidation for the stated goal so the could "buy back (Mr. Clark's assets sing money that they have stolen
 form the trusts and entities that Mr. Clark hired them to protect) for next to nothing."

1 violated the automatic bankruptcy stay), that they foreclosed instead. at th the company that
 2 alleged that it held the , from the evidence, but that is another story. What is most relevant to this
 3 current Adversary action is Deutsche's alleged post-petition fraud in pretending to represent the
 4 legal title holder, wh

5) From information and belief, Deutsche and OneWest entered into an agency relationship
 6 with each other to provide the illusion of a third party relationship for Deutsche to acquire
 7 unenforceable paper to provide the pretense of a third party "innocent" purchaser, and thus the
 8 illusion that Deutsche had rights not possessed by OneWest because they made a boneheaded
 9 move by liquidating Indymac (if they actually had enforceable paper before). The alleged goal of
 10 this transfer to defraud Plaintiff by asserting rights that they do not legally possess is
 11 transparent.

12) Even if the Indymac Parties had the right to foreclose on Plaintiff's home and business
 13 address on October 20th, 2009, which is denied, the action that they engaged in alleging to
 14 transfer that right to Deutsche Bank is alleged to have been deceptive and/or fraudulent, and thus
 15 Defendants are precluded from moving forward with their unlawful detainer actions against
 16 Plaintiff (Case # CD10-0170) for this and other reasons, including defects in service and other
 17 breaches of civil process and /or law.

18) Even if Deutsche had the right to foreclose on Plaintiff's home and business address on
 19 October 22 or November 10th, 2009, and file suit against Mr. Clark for Unlawful Detainer and a
 20 Motion for Summary Judgment, which is denied, Deutsche has no standing; the Contra Costa
21 Superior Court has no jurisdiction; and the action that Deutsche engaged in to prevent Mr. Clark
22 from asserting a defense, including violations of federal authority and due process, is alleged to
23 have been deceptive and/or fraudulent. Defendants are thus precluded from moving forward with
24 enforcement of their unlawful detainer filing against Plaintiff (Case # CD10-0170) for this and
25 other reasons, including defects in service and other breaches of civil process and /or law

22 **Ex parte Young Injunction**

23) "While a state may be immune under the Eleventh Amendment, individual state officials
 24 nonetheless may still be subject to federal injunctive relief from ongoing Bankruptcy Code
 25 violations. Before a state official actually has completed an act of wrongfully obtaining property,
 a debtor may be able to use an Ex parte Young injunction to enjoin the state official from

1 completing the seizure.(2324) An Ex parte Young injunction operates on the theory that an
 2 individual state official who is about to act or is acting in violation of federal law is not protected
 3 by the state's sovereign immunity. NBRC (National Bankruptcy Review Commission) State Sovereign Immunity In
 4 Bankruptcy After Seminole Tribe Of Florida V. Florida (<http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/nbrc/report/20semino.html> §B1)"

5 89) Ex parte Young, 209 U.S. 123 (1908), is a United States Supreme Court case that allows
 6 suits in federal courts against officials acting on behalf of states of the union to proceed despite
 7 the State's Sovereign immunity, when the individual acted unconstitutionally. Young contended
 8 that he was merely acting for the state of Minnesota when he sought to enforce its laws. The
 9 Court disagreed, holding that when a state official does something that is unconstitutional, the
 10 official cannot possibly be doing it in the name of the state, because the Supremacy Clause of the
 11 Constitution means that the Constitution overrides all the laws of the states, invalidating any
 12 contrary laws. Therefore, when a state official attempts to enforce an unconstitutional law, that
 13 individual is stripped of his official character. He becomes merely another citizen who can
 14 constitutionally be brought before a court by a party seeking injunctive relief.

15 90) The Declaration of Alan Kilpatrick filed and attached herewith shows that the Honorable
 16 Judge Mills acted in collusion with Deutsche to violate the Due Process clause of the Fourteenth
 17 Amendment and the federal authority of the bankruptcy court. A copy of the Supreme Court
 18 Ruling in Ex parte Young is provided as "EXHIBIT D"

19 "The Court, in laying out this doctrine, created two legal fictions:

20 1. That such a suit is not against the state, but merely against the individual officer, who cannot be
 21 acting on behalf of the state when he enforces a law that is unconstitutional; and
 22 2. That an individual can be a state actor for Fourteenth Amendment purposes (which only prohibits
 23 unconstitutional act by the state, and those who represent it) while remaining a private person for
 24 sovereign immunity purposes.

25 As a consequence of Ex parte Young, Congress passed two important statutes:

* § 28 U.S.C. § 2201 gives federal courts the power "to declare the rights and other legal relations of any
 19 interested party" and provides that "Any such declaration shall have the force and effect of a final
 judgment"; and

* § 28 U.S.C. § 2202 states that "Further necessary or proper relief based on a declaratory judgment or
 20 decree may be granted, after reasonable notice and hearing, against any adverse party."

The effect of § 2201 is to permit the federal courts to declare the rights of a party suing a state official
 21 (or any other party, but they were created with state officials in mind) without issuing an injunction
 22 against the official. This was thought to be more respectful of the states. However, if the court declares a
 23 statute to be unconstitutional, and the state official still prosecutes someone for violating the statute, then
 24 § 2202 takes effect, permitting the federal court to take action such as issuing an injunction and holding an
 25 official who violates that injunction in contempt.⁹

24 ⁹ Justice Peckham, writing for the Court, had a series of issues to resolve. First, he concluded that there
 25 was federal question jurisdiction in Perkins (the parties were not completely diverse), identifying a
 number of issues of federal law raised in the proceeding. (19) He then turned to one of the merits

PLAINTIFF ACTED IN GOOD FAITH AND DEFENDANTS HAVE NOT

1 91) Plaintiff acquired a loan in exchange for a note and deed of trust in or about 2005. In 2008,
 2 Plaintiff became unable to continue to make payments on his loan at the amount specified on the loan due
 3 to acts of third parties that are the subject of Binding Arbitration that is ongoing with the American
 4 Arbitration Association, Case # 74 194 Y 01440 07 JEMCO. Plaintiff has millions of dollars in assets
 5 which the Defendants in said arbitration case have tied up for the expressed goal of economic duress and
 6 the stated goal of Bankrupting Peter Clark so they can take his assets "for next to nothing."
 7 92) In or about September, 2008, Plaintiff applied to Indymac for loan modification and received a
 8 letter that he would receive a response in 30 days. Plaintiff never received the promised response.
 9 93) In July, 2008, the Governor signed into law SB 1137, which created California Civil Code 2923.5
 10 and 2923.6. On of about July, 2009 Plaintiff presented to Indymac through ACORN Housing, a proposal
 11 for Defendants to act in accordance with this law.
 12 94) The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation took over Indymac in 2008, which became subject to
 13 the policies of the Executive Branch of the United States regarding the reduction of foreclosures as part of
 14 ongoing economic stabilization.

12

13

questions: whether the penalties, designed to inhibit challenge to the rates through a defensive proceeding, were unconstitutional. He concluded that they were inconsistent with the requirements of due process because of the burden they placed on access to the courts. (20)

14

15

Having reached the merits first, perhaps to make the opinion more persuasive, Peckham turned to the question of the circuit court's jurisdiction in Perkins in light of sovereign immunity. He conducted a lengthy review of the Court's cases, (21) beginning with *Chisholm v. Georgia* (22) and continuing through more recent cases like *Fitts v. McGhee*, (23) on which Young had relied in drafting the Minnesota legislation.

16

17

18

19

After concluding that sovereign immunity did not block relief against Young, Peckham turned to another question raised by a request for an injunction: whether there was an adequate remedy at law. The railroads' remedy at law, the Court assumed, would be to assert a defense in an enforcement proceeding.

20

21

22

23

24

25

It is further objected that there is a plain and adequate remedy at law open to the complainants and that a court of equity, therefore, has no jurisdiction in such case. It has been suggested that the proper way to test the constitutionality of the act is to disobey it, at least once, after which the company might obey the act pending subsequent proceedings to test its validity. (24)

But a single violation might or might not be punished, and in any event the criminal penalties would make it hard to find anyone prepared to commit the violation (just as Young had intended). (25) Moreover, the constitutional question, involving intricate facts of corporate accounting, would be hard to explain to a jury in defense in a prosecution. Much better to let the whole thing come to equity, so the remedy at law was not adequate. (26)

Concluding that Young was properly in custody because the circuit court's injunction was proper, the Court denied relief on habeas. [<http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-177871506.html>]

1 95) In November, 2008, Barak Obama was elected President of the United States and enacted
 2 executive policies to minimize foreclosures. One West, in purchasing Indymac from the FDIC, became
 3 subject to said federal executive policies in addition to relevant California law such as California Civil
 4 Code 2923.5 and 2923.6, the Foreclosure Prevention Act, and the implied covenant of good faith and fair
 5 dealings.

6 96) Indymac antecedent OneWest alleged that they began foreclosure proceedings in the name of
 7 Indymac in or about December, 2008, but is alleged to have failed to follow the procedures proscribed by
 8 law, including regarding service of Notice of the foreclosure sale (and Deutsche for the unlawful
 9 detainer).

10 97) In or about April, 2009, Plaintiff engaged the services of ACORN Housing to pursue loan
 11 modification with Indymac. Plaintiff believed, and believes, that ACORN's policies regarding loan
 12 modification are closest to those of President Obama of any other group. ACORN assured Plaintiff that
 13 they have a higher level of access to the then secret "Indymac investors," regarding loan modification
 14 negotiations than Plaintiff would have as an individual, and Plaintiff has reason to believe that this is true.

15 98) ACORN worked with Plaintiff to insure that Plaintiff supplied all materials necessary for
 16 Indymac to complete the loan modification process, with updates as required from time-to-time. Plaintiff
 17 was told that the modification was being reviewed, and such modification was never denied.

18 99) Plaintiff became alarmed in the weeks leading up to the foreclosure date of August 4, 2009.
 19 Plaintiff called Indymac directly, only to find that the retail side of Indymac was separate from the part
 20 that was in discussion with ACORN. Plaintiff worked diligently to insure that the files on the retail side
 21 reflected the documents that Plaintiff had submitted through ACORN. Indymac assured Plaintiff that
 22 these files had been brought together, however Indymac did not stop the foreclosure date.

23 100) Plaintiff filed for bankruptcy on August 3, 2009, the day prior to the scheduled foreclosure.
 24 Plaintiff made sure that Indymac, and the trustee, was aware of Plaintiff's bankruptcy. After filing,
 25 Plaintiff was informed that Indymac cancelled the foreclosure date.

101) Plaintiff learned that during his bankruptcy he would be expected to continue to make payment
 2 on the loan at the higher, pre-loan modification rate that Plaintiff could not afford, and which needed to be
 3 modified. As a result, Plaintiff believed that his bankruptcy plan would be rejected because such a high
 4 percentage of Plaintiff's income would have to be dedicated to payments to Indymac, that Plaintiff could
 5 not afford to make any payments on other debts that are the direct and proximate result of acts by the
 6 Defendants of Plaintiff's previously referenced Binding Arbitration.

7 102) Plaintiff thus realized that loan modification was required prior to the Bankruptcy Court
 8 approving a plan.

103) Plaintiff called Indymac during the bankruptcy, and Indymac reported that they had ceased
 1 processing the loan modification, and by law could not resume said modification until Plaintiff was out of
 2 bankruptcy. Plaintiff has since learned that Indymac's statement was false, because it could have been
 3 accomplished as part of a re-affirmation of the debt. However Plaintiff did not know this at the time.
 4 Plaintiff thus relied on said false statement by Indymac to Plaintiff's detriment.

104) In September, 2009, Defendants assured Plaintiff that no foreclosure was scheduled, and that they
 5 would resume the loan modification process as soon as Plaintiff was out of bankruptcy. Once again,
 6 Plaintiff relied on Defendant's statements to his detriment, and has been damaged thereby.

105) Plaintiff's bankruptcy was dismissed on a technicality, and Plaintiff was free to re-file for
 7 bankruptcy because Plaintiff had fixed the technical problem within days of his filing for bankruptcy,
 8 however Plaintiff, in relying on Defendant's false and self-serving statements regarding the need to be out
 9 of bankruptcy, believed that he had to complete the loan modification and establish an affordable
 10 payment schedule prior to going back into bankruptcy to re-organize the remainder of his debts in the
 mutual interest of legitimate debtors, including Indymac, and Plaintiff.

106) Plaintiff thus asked Indymac if they would process the loan modification if he would remain out
 11 of bankruptcy to complete the loan modification process. Indymac representatives stated that they would,
 12 but needed proof that Plaintiff was out of bankruptcy. Plaintiff supplied said proof by fax to Indymac,
 13 together with a request that Indymac complete the loan modification process. Indymac agreed to do so,
 14 and verified that in a phone call on October 13, 2009.

107) Defendants blindsided Plaintiff by re-scheduling, and completing, the foreclosure of Plaintiff's
 15 home in secret one week later (October 20th). Defendants kept said foreclosure process secret not only
 16 from Plaintiff, but also from the holder of the second deed of trust, who alleges that he never received any
 17 notice of foreclosure sale (See declaration of Alan Kilpatrick). Plaintiff alleges that Indymac has engaged
 18 in deceptive and unfair business practices to defraud Plaintiff of possession of his home during the time of
 19 Plaintiff's business re-organization required as a direct and proximate result of malfeasant acts by the
 Defendants in the previously referenced Binding Arbitration.

108) Plaintiff acted in good faith at all times related to the loan modification, and Indymac did not.

21 **Deception and Undue Influence**

22 109) Those in Agency relationship with Deutsche used economic duress regarding the high payments
 23 required by Plaintiff's unmodified loan to force Plaintiff to remain out of bankruptcy in order to fix the
 24 problem by the loan modification that it now appears Defendants had no intention of granting.

110) In the capacity as alleged Note Holder, Indymac and OneWest deceived Plaintiff with promises
 1 to move Plaintiff's loan modification forward, and other deception.

111) In said capacity as alleged Note Holder, Defendants exercised undue influence over Plaintiff to
 3 cause Plaintiff to come out of bankruptcy protection to complete the loan modification process.

112) Defendants' deception and apparent violations of the implied covenant of good faith and fair
 4 dealings in their relations with Plaintiff is particularly egregious because Indymac had previously
 5 informed Plaintiff that:

- 6 a. No foreclosure was scheduled
- 7 b. Plaintiff had to get out of bankruptcy prior to completing the loan modification process begun with
 Indymac many months before, which process appeared to be nearly completed.
- 8 c. Indymac had previously indicated that all that remained to complete the loan modification was
 Plaintiff showing the increased income that he was able to prove prior to his having to step into
 bankruptcy to prevent the foreclosure in the interim. Plaintiff showed that income, and thereafter,
 Plaintiff was able to show twice as much income.
- 9 d. Plaintiff's bankruptcy was dismissed without discharge for a technical reason that Plaintiff had
 already fixed, allowing Plaintiff to make a clean re-filing. however Plaintiff chose not to do so
 specifically because of the representations by Indymac that would have allowed Plaintiff's
 10 bankruptcy plan to succeed, something that did not appear possible in the absence of loan
 modification.
- 11 e. Such representations by Indymac included a telephone call to Plaintiff on the 13th of October by a
 12 representative of Indymac requesting additional information that Plaintiff supplied the next day (one
 13 week after Indymac had secretly re-scheduled the foreclosure, and a week before they completed the
 14 foreclosure, also in secret from Plaintiff.)

15) Thus, Plaintiff relied on the false and/or misleading statements by Indymac to Plaintiff's
 16 detriment, including the telephone call on October 13th.

17) Plaintiff has suffered damages as a result of his reliance on Defendants' misrepresentations.

18) Plaintiff informed Indymac of ways they could mitigate the damages, however Indymac has
 19 refused, and continues to refuse, to do so.

20) Completing the loan modification was a high priority for Plaintiff for the above stated and other
 21 reasons:

- 22 a. Plaintiff's home is more value to Plaintiff than it would be to Defendants on the open market,
 including because Plaintiff's office and shop area is in a detached garage on the same property. The
 23 house next door is for sale, and has been vacant for months.

1 b. Plaintiff has numerous business opportunities, and needs to concentrate on re-starting his business at
 2 this time, which business has been placed on hold as a result of the acts of third parties that are in
 3 binding arbitration. Plaintiff cannot focus on restarting his business while being distracted by the loss
 4 of his home, shop, and office.

5 117) Defendants were precluded from their foreclosure by the automatic stay in the bankruptcy, and
 6 thus deceived Plaintiff to step out of bankruptcy protection rather than completing a loan modification as
 7 part of a re-affirmation of the debt in Plaintiff's bankruptcy under the oversight of the bankruptcy trustee,
 8 as now appears to be federal policy in keeping with the stated executive goals of the Obama
 9 Administration in the absence of action by the United States Congress.

10 118) In failing to proceed with the loan modification as a re-affirmation in the bankruptcy and in
 11 proceeding in the foreclosure of the property of the Debtor, Defendants created a minefield of problems,
 12 while counting on the fact that the economic dress that Plaintiff faces will prevent him from protecting his
 13 rights and the public interest in reversing the foreclosure.

14 119) As a result, an actual controversy has arisen and now exists between the Plaintiff and the
 15 Defendants concerning their respective rights regarding Defendant's secret foreclosure proceeding while
 16 stating to Plaintiff that they were actively engaged in loan modification.

17 **13 Deutsche has Engaged in a Pattern of Fraud**

18 120) Our society has placed lenders in a position of trust by providing them with special, expedited
 19 legal processes whenever their agents proclaim by fiat that they have complied with all legal requirements
 20 to take ownership of their client's property, however it appears that said agents have succumbed to the
 21 same pressures as the overseers of undersea oil drilling in failing to act in keeping with the public trust, as
 22 delineated further herein. According to rulings of State and Federal Judges since 2007, Defendants have
 23 engaged in a pattern of violations of that trust by engaging in numerous violations of state and federal
 24 law, first related to their sub-prime loans, and second by their "eviction mill" process to evict their clients
 25 from their homes without taking the actual legal steps for actual ownership, without complying with
 notice requirements, and, as now demonstrated by their violations of federal authority and due process.

21 121) By purchasing Indymac and its portfolio of loans from the Federal Government at a steep
 22 discount that anticipated the loan modifications that would have to be enacted, OneWest became the
 23 beneficiary of the profits that Deutsche is now attempting to extract by allegedly illegal means on their
 24 behalf. However the evidence indicates that Indymac's portfolio is, to a large extent, worthless. This is
 25 alleged because the evidence indicates that Indymac generally did not acquire, or transfer, actual legal
 rights related to said portfolio, but merely the electronic representation of rights that they never

1 possessed¹⁰. In addition, OneWest liquidated Indymac without transferring the assets in an apparent
 2 attempt to evade the taxes on the capital gain from their purchase of the discounted notes. The evidence
 3 indicates that Deutsche is now acting contrary to public policy to exacerbate the problem that One West
 4 was supposed to resolve.

5 122) The evidence indicates that Deutsche has acted in an agency relationship and/or in conspiracy
 6 with One West in engaging in the acts and omissions complained about herein, and the scope of this
 7 agency relationship and/or conspiracy will be delineated by reasonable discovery.

8 123) During the debate about bailing-out the banks, Congress decided that non-US banks should not
 9 be getting TARP funds. From information and belief, of the \$50 billion the Feds have given to AIG's
 10 counter-parties, Deutsche Bank is alleged to have received \$6 billion, contrary to the intent of Congress.
 11 If, in fact, the reason that Deutsche never incorporated was to evade American taxes, then the \$6 Billion
 12 in Bailout money would appear to be doubly egregious.

13 124) From information and belief on October 22, 2009, Real Estate Broker/Agent Rebecca "Williams"
 14 came to the premises of Unit "B" and informed tenant Mary Bauer that a foreclosure had occurred on
 15 October 20th, 2009, and that Indymac had taken possession of the property by nature of said foreclosure.
 16 Ms. Williams is alleged to have informed Mary Bauer that she had sixty days to vacate the premises.
 17 Mary Bauer then informed Plaintiff, Peter Clark of said visit and said alleged foreclosure.

18 125) Upon hearing the allegation that a foreclosure had taken place, Peter Clark immediately called
 19 Indymac, with whom Mr. Clark was actively engaged in loan modification at the time. Indymac confirmed
 20 that the property was an "REO" (real estate owned) of the bank, and that Indymac had taken the property in
 21 a foreclosure action on October 20, 2009, when no third party came forward to purchase the property at the
 22 Trustee sale. Indymac verified said alleged "fact" in a letter to Plaintiff dated November 17, 2009.

23 126) For its alleged innocent purchaser status, Deutsche now infers that it purchased the Note and Deed
 24 of Trust from Indymac sometime after October 20th and before the end of November 10th, 2009, and did
 25 not foreclose until said November 10th date. Plaintiff did not learn of this allegation until receiving a copy of
 an unlawful detainer action against him in or about March 11, 2010. Deutsche also infers that it mad the
 switch five years ago, inferring that Indymac has engaged in fraudulent misrepresentation for the duration.

26 127) Either way OneWest's previous representation that the property/deed was foreclosed on October
 27 20, 2009 constituted fraudulent misrepresentation regarding what Deutsche now alleges. Plaintiff relied
 28
 29

30 10 While virtually all of the major banks in this state have recognized their responsibility and have created
 31 loan modification programs that have been approved by the commissioner in keeping with the intent of the
 32 Foreclosure Prevention Act, Indymac and OneWest are a notable exception.

1 on Deutsche's misrepresentations in October and thereafter to his detriment, and has been damaged
 2 thereby in an amount to be ascertained at trial.

3 128) The date of Correspondence from Indymac/One West, November 17, 2009, is nearly one month
 4 AFTER Defendants first alleged that they had acted in secret to foreclose on Plaintiff's home while
 5 pretending to be in active loan modification negotiations, and one week after they now allege that they
 6 foreclosed on November 10th. Up until this November 17th letter, Defendants repeatedly acknowledged
 7 to Plaintiff that they had received all of the necessary documentation for loan modification review, and
 8 were actively pursuing said loan modification.

9 129) Deutsche and One West are both alleged to have lacked standing to engage in a foreclosure
 10 action. Regardless of such lack of standing, acting in agency relationship with each other, they are alleged
 11 to have taken advantage of their position of trust by fraudulent misrepresentations in violation of the
 12 Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealings as a key element of their failure to act responsibly in keeping
 13 with banking regulations, law, and the intent of the California Legislature and the Obama Administration,
 14 and now hold the property of Plaintiff in Constructive Trust due to their deceptive business practices and
 15 violations of law.

16 130) A further actual controversy has arisen related to the secretive dealings between the Indymac
 17 Parties and Deutsche Bank related to their now alleged foreclosure proceedings on November 10,
 18 three weeks after Indymac's previously alleged foreclosure proceedings on October 20, 2009. In all
 19 cases there is a question of standing. *In re Foreclosure Cases* Judge Boyko ordered Deutsche Bank to
 20 produce evidence of standing, but the copies of notes and mortgages Deutsche Bank included with its
 21 filings don't show ultimate endorsement/assignment to Deutsche Bank. Judge ordered Deutsche Bank to
 22 fix this. Deutsche Bank did so by having its attorneys draft after-the-fact assignments, undoubtedly
 23 because nobody could find the original assignments. It appears this angered Judge Boyko.

24 131) As in the current case, Deutsche Bank alleges that it was acting as "Trustee" for "securitization
 25 pools." But the evidence indicates that the Trustee never got the legal document known as the mortgage.
 1 Judge Boyko ordered Deutsche Bank to prove they were the owners of the mortgages or notes, and they
 2 could not, as in the current situation. Deutsche Bank could only argue that the banks had foreclosed on
 3 such cases for years without challenge. The Judge then declared that the banks "seem to adopt the attitude
that since they have been doing this for so long, unchallenged, this practice equates with legal
compliance. Finally put to the test," the Judge concluded, "their weak legal arguments compel the court
to stop them at the gate."

26 132) With "*in re Foreclosure Cases*" there was never a question that the loans weren't legally sold or
 27 assigned to Deutsche Bank. In Ohio, it appears that the question related solely to the arrogance and

compliance. Finally put to the test," the Judge concluded, "their weak legal arguments compel the court to stop them at the gate."

132) With "*in re Foreclosure Cases*" there was never a question that the loans weren't legally sold or assigned to Deutsche Bank. In Ohio, it appears that the question related solely to the arrogance and audacity of a lender telling a judge to ignore its sloppy paperwork and just get on with a foreclosure. The Judge chose to act by law instead. Here there are added questions related to the two alleged foreclosure dates (October 20 and November 10, 2009).

133) Plaintiff respectfully requests that this court also act according to law by ordering a voidance of Defendants' alleged foreclosure actions in keeping with the ruling of the Federal Court as well as California and other State Courts related to alleged foreclosures accomplished without actual standing, and nullification of the alleged rights of Defendants related to the subject property which they have abused by their fraudulent acts and/or other violations of law and/or public policy which, the evidence indicates Defendants were engaged in to slough over and conceal their apparent lack of standing.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF
First Cause of Action- (Fraud)
(Against Deutsche Bank National Trust Company)

Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 133 hereinabove and all other paragraphs hereinafter as though fully set forth herein. Plaintiff in particular, reference this cause of action, directs the parties to re-alleged Paragraphs

5-15, Parties, Agency, and Jurisdiction;

16-24 Synopsis of Pre-Petition Events Leading to Post Petition Damaging Acts;

¶ 25- 28, Post Petition Violations of Federal Authority and Due Process;

¶ 29-43, Deutsche Refuses to Meet & Confer RE: Abandonment of Asset by Trustee [11 USC §5541];

44-50, Background Violations of Law;

¶ 51-73 Further Violations of Law;

74, Deutsche's Lack Of Standing and Violations of Due Process;

¶ 75-87, Declaratory Relief Required;

188-90, *Ex parte Young* Injunction;

¶ 91-108, Plaintiff Acted In Good Faith

109-119, Deception and Undue Influence;

¹¹ 120-133, Deutsche has Engaged in a Pattern

“ ”

134) By the acts set forth above, Defendants have made material representations regarding their alleged standing and capacity and/or about their foreclosing on the Subject Property on October 20th or November 10, 2009, and/or related to the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court and the Bankruptcy act after Plaintiffs filing for bankruptcy, including to this court, which

1 statements are false, and when said representations were made, Defendants knew these
 2 representations were false or made them recklessly without any knowledge of the truth or in
 3 callus disregard thereof, and as a positive assertion; Defendants made the representation with
 4 the intent that Plaintiff should act upon said assertions. In so doing they are alleged to have
 5 violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Title 15 Chapter 41 Subchapter V § 1692
 6 Subchapter V—Debt Collection Practices § 1692e. False or misleading representations; §
 7 1692f. Unfair practices.

8 135) Plaintiff acted in reliance on Defendant-s representation and thereby suffered injury in an
 9 amount to be ascertained at trial.

10 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief according to proof.

11

- 12 a. That this action be tried in front of a jury.
- 13 b. For an award of reasonable attorneys' fees.
- 14 c. For an award to Plaintiff of costs of suit incurred herein on all causes of action;
- 15 d. Such other and further relief as the court shall deem just and proper.

16 **SECOND Cause Of Action (Declaration of Constructive Trust)**

17 **(Against All Defendants)**

18 136) Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 135 hereinabove and all other paragraphs
 19 hereinafter as though fully set forth herein. Plaintiff in particular, reference this cause of
 20 action, directs the parties to re-alleged Paragraphs:

21 ¶¶ 16-24 Synopsis of Pre-Petition Events Leading to Post Petition Damaging Acts;
 22 ¶¶ 25- 28, Post Petition Violations of Federal Authority and Due Process;
 23 ¶¶ 51-73 Further Violations of Law;
 24 ¶¶ 74, Deutsche's Lack Of Standing and Violations of Due Process;
 25 ¶¶ 75-87, Declaratory Relief Required;
 26 ¶¶ 88-90, Ex parte Young Injunction;
 27 ¶¶ 109-119, Deception and Undue Influence;
 28 ¶¶ 120-133, Deutsche has Engaged in a Pattern of Fraud.

29 137) By virtue of the acts set forth in the re-alleged paragraphs herein, defendants, and each
 30 of them, took on the responsibilities of the constructive trust represented by their position as

1 electronic note-holders and alleged successors at interest without the de jure right to
2 foreclose, and without possessing the actual notes. By acting without actual standing in
3 acting to evict the Plaintiff, Defendants have been unjustly enriched. By virtue of this
4 unjust enrichment, defendants, and each of them, have become constructive trustees of
Peter Clark's home, office, and shop, for the benefit of Peter Clark.

5 138) It is therefore necessary that this Court compel Defendants, and each of them, to
reverse the foreclosure and for the Court to impose upon Defendants, and each of them,
6 the duties and responsibilities of Constructive Trustees. It is also therefore necessary that
7 this Court (a) make an order declaring that defendants, and each of them, hold said interest
8 in the real and personal property held by defendants in trust for Peter Clark, and (b) order
9 a re-conveyance of all such real and personal property held by defendants, and each of
10 them, to Peter Clark.

11 139) As a further proximate result of the common allegations set forth herein, Plaintiff has
12 been forced to act as his own attorney and/or to hire attorneys to protect his rights, and
13 has incurred and continues to incur costs, loss of income, and/or attorneys' fees.

14 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for relief according to proof as set forth hereinafter.

15 a. That this action be tried before a jury;
16 b. For general property damages according to proof;
17 c. For general personal injury damages according to proof;
18 d. For punitive damages;
19 e. For an award of reasonable attorneys' fees.
20 f. For an award to Plaintiff of costs of suit incurred herein on all causes of action;
21 g. Such other and further relief as the court shall deem just and proper.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION – DECLARATORY RELIEF
Against DEUTSCHE BANK

140) Peter Clark re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 139 hereinabove and all other paragraphs
 hereinafter as though fully set forth herein. Plaintiff in particular, reference this cause of action,
 directs the parties to re-alleged Paragraphs:

¶ 16-24 Synopsis of Pre-Petition Events Leading to Post Petition Damaging Acts;
 ¶ 25- 28, Post Petition Violations of Federal Authority and Due Process;
 ¶ 51-73Further Violations of Law;
 ¶ 74, Deutsche's Lack Of Standing and Violations of Due Process;
 ¶ 75-87, Declaratory Relief Required;

141) An actual controversy has arisen and continues between Peter and Deutsche designated
 in this cause of action over Deutsche's claim that they received title to the home of Peter Clark
 by an act that is void by collateral estoppels, and regarding Deutsche's standing and authority.

142) This controversy is centered upon the following:

- a. Does Deutsche have the authority and/or legal right to act in the place of a court of law
 to make the ruling of law that they are a bona fide third party purchaser of the Note and
 Deed of Trust on Peter Clark's home of 30 years without providing foundation for such a
 claim, such as evidence of consideration, the contractual agreements, or other documents
 or declarations?
- b. Does Bruce Mills have the right to decide issues that are within the jurisdiction of the
 bankruptcy trustee without due process, and thus violate the civil rights of a debtor?
- c. Does Deutsche have the authority and/or legal right to act in the place of the bankruptcy
 court by representing to the Contra Costa Superior Court that a bankruptcy trustee can
 abandon an asset without an order from the Bankruptcy Judge despite the requirements of
 law, and/or that a relief from stay alone releases an asset from the Authority of the
 Bankruptcy Court?
- d. Does Deutsche have the legal right to engage in extensive ex parte communications
 with the Judge of the Contra Costa Superior Court that appears to a third party to constitute
 collusion all outside of the presence of opposing counsel?
- e. Does Deutsche have the authority and/or legal right to act during the automatic
 bankruptcy stay of Debtor, Peter Clark without first receiving a relief from stay from the
 Bankruptcy Court in Peter Clark's Bankruptcy?

143) Mr. Clark desires a judicial determination and declaration of Mr. Clark 's and the
 1 defendants' respective rights and duties under all of the agreements between the parties
 2 regarding the subject property.

144) The declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time, so that Mr. Clark can
 1 determine his rights, obligations and duties under said agreements. Without such declaration
 2 Mr. Clark will face the burden of loss of use of property and attendant benefits caused by the
 3 unsettled state of affairs resulting from different interpretations of agreements, and other
 4 remedies are and would be inadequate. These circumstances include the loss of Mr. Clark's
 5 home, office, and workshop, and the loss of Mr. Clark's way of life.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief according to proof as set forth hereinafter and for
 judgment against Defendants and each of them, as follows

- A. For an order that the acts of Deutsche that were accomplished after Peter Clark's
 bankruptcy related to the Note and Deed of Trust secured by the Subject Premises without notice
 to, much less approval by the Bankruptcy trustee a relief from stay from the bankruptcy Court
 and abandonment of the asset by the Trustee are void in accordance with law and public policy.
- B. For a declaration that the Note and Deed of Trust is void, together with all collection efforts,
 and a declaration that Deutsche has no standing related to Peter Clark's Bankruptcy proceedings.
- C. For damages, costs of suits, and defense of suits incurred; an
- D. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

FOURTH Cause Of Action (Violations of Business and Professions Code Section 17200)

145) Peter re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 144 hereinabove and all other paragraphs
 hereinafter as though fully set forth herein. Plaintiff in particular, reference this cause of
 action, directs the parties to re-alleged Paragraphs:

- ¶ 16-24 Synopsis of Pre-Petition Events Leading to Post Petition Damaging Acts;
- ¶ 25- 28, Post Petition Violations of Federal Authority and Due Process;
- ¶ 51-73Further Violations of Law;
- ¶ 74, Deutsche's Lack Of Standing and Violations of Due Process;
- ¶ 75-87, Declaratory Relief Required;

1 ¶109-119, Deception and Undue Influence;
 2 ¶ 120-133, Deutsche has Engaged in a Pattern of Fraud.

3 146) By virtue of the terms of the agreements determined by public policy set forth above
 4 in the incorporated paragraphs, there existed between Peter, on the one hand, and
 5 Deutsche Bank, Indymac and OneWest and each of them, on the other hand, a
 6 relationship of trust and confidence giving rise to a fiduciary duty in each of these
 7 defendants in their capacity as lenders during an economic emergency, to deal with Peter
 8 Clark, with the utmost good faith, honesty and integrity, based upon the special trust
 9 placed by the American public and by Peter Clark, in these defendants and other lenders,
 10 as shown by policies related to summary proceedings in unlawful detainer and foreclosure
 11 which border on a violation of due process even when the letter of the law is adhered to,
 12 and the Moving Party is not engaged in deceptive business practices. Without honesty
 13 and integrity, and where those placed in such trust exceed their authority of law for
 14 expedience or to squeeze windfall profits, the balance is tipped past the point of violation
 15 of due process and thus civil rights or those at the receiving end of the summary
 16 proceedings.

17 147) In enacting California Civil Code 2923.5, 2923.6, and the Foreclosure Prevention Act, it
 18 was the clear intent of the California Legislature to reduce the number of foreclosures in this
 19 state by requiring good faith efforts by the lenders to engage in loan modification.

20 148) The United State Congress did not take action to require Bankruptcy Judges to force loan
 21 modification, however. Thus, when Defendants reported that they would complete the loan
 22 modification once the bankruptcy proceedings were halted, Plaintiff acted in accordance
 23 with Defendant's directives to Plaintiff's detriment.

24 149) In inducing Plaintiff to take actions that have caused the damages at issue herein,
 25 Indymac's and One West's pre-petition conduct as described herein constitutes unfair,
 26 unlawful, and fraudulent business practices in violation of California Business and
 27 Professions Code Section 17200 et seq. Those acts by Indymac and One West's were

1 pre-petition, however, and the subject of pre-petition litigation which the case trustee has
 2 agreed to abandon, however the court has not yet abandoned it.

3 150) By acting post-petition in an agency relationship with the One West Parties, Deutsche
 4 Bank become a full Party to fraud, and fully liable for the damages. Deutsche is not listed
 5 as a party to the pre-petition litigation. Deutsche Banks' actions are post-petition, and
 6 thus the subject of this instant action.

7 151) Peter Clark is entitled to restitution of all gains, benefits, fees and monies obtained by
 8 Defendants from the wrongful conduct alleged above in an amount according to proof.

9 152) As a proximate result of these actions by defendant Deutsche Bank, and Peter's
 10 reliance thereon, Peter Clark has been damaged as more fully described herein in an
 11 amount that can be mitigated by actions of this court, and thus which must be ascertained
 12 in a final accounting at trial.

13 153) In doing the post petition actions herein alleged, Deutsche Bank acted with
 14 oppression, fraud, malice, reckless disregard of Peter Clark's rights and the consequences
 15 that they might suffer, and with the intent to injure Peter Clark in his financial and
 16 personal interests, and Peter is therefore entitled to recover punitive damages from these
 17 defendants, and each of them, for the commission by each of them of this tort.

18 154) As a further proximate result of the activities set forth herein related to Deutsche
 19 Bank's, unlawful activities in violation of Business and Profession Code Section 17200,
 20 Peter Clark has incurred and continues to incur substantial time dedicated to these cases
 21 and/or attorneys' fees.

22 Wherefore, Peter prays for relief according to proof as set forth hereinafter.

- 23 (a) That this action be tried before a jury;
- 24 (b) For general property damages according to proof;
- (c) For general personal injury damages according to proof;
- (d) For double damages as allowed by law
- (e) For punitive damages;
- (f) For an award of reasonable attorneys' fees.
- (g) For an award to Peter of costs of suit incurred herein on all causes of action;
- (h) Such other and further relief as the court shall deem just and proper.

Fifth Cause Of Action

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF- *Ex parte Young*

155) Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 154 hereinabove and all other paragraphs
hereinafter as though fully set forth herein. Plaintiff in particular, reference this cause of
action, directs the parties to re-alleged Paragraphs

188-90, *Ex parte Young* Injunction, as well as

16-24 Synopsis of Pre-Petition Events Leading to Post Petition Damaging Acts;

¶ 25-28, Post Petition Violations of Federal Authority and Due Process;

¶ 51-73 Further Violations of Law;

¶74, Deutsche's Lack Of Standing and Violations of Due Process;

¶ 75-87, Declaratory Relief Required;

109-119, Deception and Undue Influence;

¶ 120-133, Deutsche has Engaged in a Pattern of Fraud.

156) The Declaration of Alan Kilpatrick filed and attached herewith and other evidence shows that the Honorable Bruce Mills acted in collusion with Deutsche in violation of the Due Process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and the federal authority of the bankruptcy court and the Bankruptcy Act, and thus for which Bruce Mills had no jurisdiction as a judge of the Superior Court. The evidence indicates that in so doing, the Honorable Bruce Mills acted as an individual outside of his capacity as a judge of the Superior Court of California in collusion with Deutsche Bank National Trust Company.

157) In so doing, Bruce Mills is acting unconstitutionally and in violation of federal law, and is thus not protected by the state's sovereign immunity. As such, Bruce Mills is subject to federal injunctive relief for ongoing violations. These acts have not been completed, and can be mitigated by a voluntary act of Bruce Mills or injunctive relief by this court, however because the litigation is part of the trust estate under the jurisdiction of the case trustee, Peter Clark has no other recourse than through this court via an Ex parte Young injunction to this court to enjoin Bruce Mills from completing the seizure, and to reverse the wrongfully act of Defendants obtaining property for which the debtor retains a claim through a pre-petition filing against Indymac and One West Bank which the bankruptcy court has not yet ordered the trustee to abandon.

1 As a consequence of *Ex parte Young*, Congress passed two important statutes:

2 * § 28 U.S.C. § 2201 gives federal courts the power "to declare the rights and other legal relations of any
interested party" and provides that "Any such declaration shall have the force and effect of a final
judgment"; and

3 * § 28 U.S.C. § 2202 states that "Further necessary or proper relief based on a declaratory judgment or
decree may be granted, after reasonable notice and hearing, against any adverse party."

4 These acts have not been completed, and can be mitigated by a voluntary act of Bruce Mills or
5 injunctive relief by this court, however because the litigation is part of the trust estate under the
6 jurisdiction of the case trustee, Peter Clark has no other recourse than through this court via an *Ex*
7 *parte Young* injunction to this court to enjoin Bruce Mills from completing the seizure, and to
8 reverse the wrongfully act of Defendants obtaining property for which the debtor retains a claim
9 through a pre-petition filing against Indymac and One West Bank which the bankruptcy court has
10 not yet ordered the trustee to abandon.

11 The effect of § 2201 is to permit the federal courts to declare the rights of a party suing a state official (or any other
12 party, but they were created with state officials in mind) without issuing an injunction against the official. This was
13 thought to be more respectful of the states. However, if the court declares a statute to be unconstitutional, and the state
14 official still prosecutes someone for violating the statute, then § 2202 takes effect, permitting the federal court to take
15 action such as issuing an injunction and holding an official who violates that injunction in contempt

16 Wherefore, Peter prays for relief according to proof as set forth hereinafter.

- 17 • For injunctive relief
- 18 • "to declare the rights and other legal relations of any interested party" and provide
19 that "Any such declaration shall have the force and effect of a final judgment"; and
- 20 • "Further necessary or proper relief based on a declaratory judgment or decree
- 21 • Such other and further relief as the court shall deem just and proper.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION –**VIOLATIONS OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE Section 17200**

158) Mr. Clark re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 157 hereinabove and all other paragraphs
 2 hereinafter as though fully set forth herein. Plaintiff in particular, reference this cause of action,
 3 directs the parties to re-alleged Paragraphs

4 **¶ 16-24 Synopsis of Pre-Petition Events Leading to Post Petition Damaging Acts;**
 5 **¶ 25- 28, Post Petition Violations of Federal Authority and Due Process;**
 6 **¶ 51-73 Further Violations of Law;**
 7 **¶ 74, Deutsche's Lack Of Standing and Violations of Due Process;**
 8 **¶ 75-87, Declaratory Relief Required;**
 9 **¶ 88-90, Ex parte Young Injunction;**
 10 **¶ 109-119, Deception and Undue Influence;**
 11 **¶ 120-133, Deutsche has Engaged in a Pattern of Fraud.**

159) Deutsche engaged in misrepresentation, concealment, and other deceptive practices
 9 and then violated bankruptcy laws and filed litigation against Mr. Clark during the time of the
 10 automatic stay of Mr. Clark's bankruptcy as a key element of their damaging acts as
 11 described herein. This constitutes unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent business practices in
 12 violation of California Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq.. Said violations
 13 of law have caused economic duress to Mr. Clark. As a proximate result of these actions by
 14 Respondents, and each of them, and Mr. Clark's reliance thereon, Peter has been damaged as
 15 more fully described above in an amount to be ascertained at trial.

160) Mr. Clark is entitled to restitution of all gains, benefits, fees and monies obtained by
 16 Respondents from the wrongful conduct alleged above in an amount according to proof.

17 161) In doing the actions herein, Respondents, and each of them, acted with oppression,
 18 fraud, malice, reckless disregard of Mr. Clark 's rights and the consequences that they might
 19 suffer, and with the intent to injure Mr. Clark in his financial and personal interests and the
 20 interests of intended beneficiaries, who are therefore entitled to recover punitive damages
 21 from these Respondents, and each of them, for the commission by each of them of this tort.

22 Wherefore, Peter prays for, costs of suits and defense of suits incurred; For damages for loss of
 23 income and business advantage that could reasonably be imputed for the delays in the
 24 prosecution of Mr. Clark's claims;

25 For double damages, and other relief according to proof as set forth hereinafter; and

For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

RICO CLAIMS

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT- 18
U.S.C. § 1962(c)

162) Mr. Clark re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 161 hereinabove and all other paragraphs
 hereinafter as though fully set forth herein. Plaintiff in particular, reference this cause of action,
 directs the parties to re-alleged Paragraphs

¶¶ 16-24 Synopsis of Pre-Petition Events Leading to Post Petition Damaging Acts;

¶¶ 25- 28, Post Petition Violations of Federal Authority and Due Process;

¶¶ 51-73Further Violations of Law;

¶¶ 74, Deutsche's Lack Of Standing and Violations of Due Process;

¶¶ 75-87, Declaratory Relief Required;

¶¶ 88-90, Ex parte Young Injunction;

¶¶ 109-119, Deception and Undue Influence;

¶¶ 120-133, Deutsche has Engaged in a Pattern of Fraud.

163) At all relevant times, Deutsche Bank and its agency relationships with the OneWest
 Parties constituted an "enterprise," within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(4) and 1962(c).

(a) David Bryant, William P. Kinsey, A. Ron Evangelista, George Carasco, Jeffrey Hill,
 and Louis Schofield are individual "persons," within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(3) and
 1962(c), who associated with and/or participated in the conduct of said enterprise's affairs.

(b) Between April, 2007and November, 2009, Respondents conducted, participated in,
 engaged in, conspired to engage in, or aided and abetted, the conduct of the affairs of "Kinsey
 Investment Club" through a pattern of racketeering activity within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. §§
 1961(1), 1961(5) and 1962(c). Respondent's pattern of racketeering activity consisted of:

- (i) Designing the Bryant's Notes to cause disproportionate damages to Petitioner.
- (ii) Use of extortion to induce Petitioner to sign said Bryant's Notes.
- (iii) economic duress by failing to deliver on Respondent's promise through Bryant of
 consideration in exchange for the Bryant's Notes and/or further extortion via economic duress and
 under the color of law provided by their abuse of process. Said acts of extortion were in violation
 of 18 U.S.C. § 1951;
- (iv) intimidation and threatens to corruptly persuade Peter Clark, or attempts to do so, or
 engage in misleading conduct toward Peter Clark, with intent to influence, delay, dissuade, or
 prevent Peter from acting in keeping with Peter's agreement
- (v) a scheme to defraud by economic duress facilitated by litigation filed during the time of
 Bryant's bankruptcy in violation of federal law that was knowingly and intentionally devised by
 Respondents to obtain Peter Clark's money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses,
 representations, or promises; and, for the purpose of executing such scheme, Respondents placed
 or foreseeably caused to be placed in a post office, or authorized depository for mail, matter that
 furthered the scheme to defraud, including but not limited to pleadings and other papers related to

their litigation, whether or not filed with the Superior court with allegation that they knew to be false, as memorialized by the proof-of-service as a key element of their fraud.

164) With each of the filings by Respondents with the Superior Court of California and to this court related to lawsuits and motions that Respondents have prosecuted against Mr. Clark for the demonstrated goal of bankrupting Peter and for the larger alleged goal of economic duress and financial elder abuse described throughout these pleadings. Respondents committed mail fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C § 1341, each time they used or foreseeably caused the mails to be used to distribute the above described materials.

(vi) using the mail or any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to distribute the proceeds of extortion or otherwise promote, manage, establish, or carry on a scheme to extort and thereafter performed or attempted to perform said acts, including in filing and mailing pleadings related to litigation against Peter Clark filed during the time of David Bryant's Bankruptcy for the purpose of causing economic duress in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1952.

165) These acts all occurred after the effective date of RICO and more than two such acts occurred within ten years of one another.

(in alternative)

166) Mr. Clark re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 165 hereinabove and all other paragraphs
hereinafter as though fully set forth herein. Plaintiff in particular, reference this cause of
action, directs the parties to re-alleged Paragraphs

¶ 16-24 Synopsis of Pre-Petition Events Leading to Post Petition Damaging Acts;

¶ 25-28, Post Petition Violations of Federal Authority and Due Process;

¶ 51-73 Further Violations of Law;

¶74. Deutsche's Lack Of Standing and Violations of Due Process:

¶ 75-87. Declaratory Relief Required;

188-90. Ex parte Young Injunction:

109-119. Deception and Undue Influence

¶ 120-133. Deutsche has Engaged in a Pattern of Fraud.

167) At all relevant times, "The Kinsey Parties" Investment Club and its endeavors constituted an "enterprise." within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(4) and 1962(c).

168) In the alternative to the Sixth Cause of Action, The Kinsey Parties and their
 1 agents/alleged clients/alleged co-conspirators conspired to conduct or participate, directly or
 2 indirectly, in the conduct of the affairs of the Investment Club enterprises through a pattern of
 3 racketeering activity in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1962(d). Respondents intended to further their
 4 endeavor that, if completed, would satisfy all of the elements of a substantive RICO criminal
 5 offense adopted the goal of furthering or facilitating the criminal endeavor. In particular, prior
 6 to December 2009, Bryant was not acting within the scope of his employment when he engaged
 7 with Kinsey Party lawyer Dave Delephant to create Bryant's Notes in a manner that would cause
 8 the maximum damages to Petitioners, or when Bryant provided false and/or misleading
 9 information to the Sacramento bankruptcy court or Schofield provided false information to his
 10 bankruptcy court related to the attorney client privileged documents that were part of
 11 Respondent's extortion.

169) Peter Clark and others were injured by Respondents' overt acts in furtherance of
 1 Respondents; illegal scheme and said overt acts were acts of racketeering or otherwise unlawful
 2 under the RICO statute:

13 (a) A scheme to defraud (see supra ¶¶ 30-68) that was knowingly and intentionally devised
 14 by Bryant and then Kinsey Party attorney Dave Delephant to defraud Peter Clark by means
 15 of extortion, failure of consideration, and false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or
 16 promises; and, for the purpose of executing such scheme, Respondents and others have
 17 placed or foreseeably caused to be placed in a post office, or authorized depository for mail,
 18 matter that furthered the scheme to defraud (including but not limited to all pleadings in the
 19 their case in Contra Costa County filed during Bryant's bankruptcy in violation of the
 20 automatic bankruptcy stay; and threats to and actual disclosure of attorney-client privileged
 21 documents during a time when Petitioner was unable to enjoin Respondent Bryant or
 22 otherwise restrain Bryant from his damaging acts because of Bryant's bankruptcy and the
 23 automatic stay required thereto.

24 Respondents filings with the Superior Court became the primary vehicle for their
 25 fraud. Thus, all of the "service-by-mail" which are recorded by the innumerable "proofs-of-
 service" that Respondents have caused to be filed with the Court Clerk constitute sworn
 statements of mail fraud. in violation of 18 U.S.C § 1341

1 (b) Respondent's filings and failure to perform also constitutes extortion via economic
2 duress, including under the color of law and violation of 18 U.S.C. §894; and 18 U.S.C. §
3 1344.

4 170) As a direct and proximate result of, and by reason of, the activities of the Respondents
5 and their conduct in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1962(d), Peter Clark has been injured in his
6 businesses, person, and/or property within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c). Mr. Clark is,
7 therefore, entitled to recover threefold the damages he has sustained together with the cost of the
8 suit, including reasonable attorneys' and experts' fees and costs.

9
10 Respectively Submitted,

11
12 
Peter Clark, in pro per

13
14 October 2, 2010
15 Date

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
VERIFICATION

I, Peter Clark, state that I have read the foregoing and know its contents. The same is
true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters that are stated on information and belief,
and as to those matters, I believe them to be true. I declare under penalty of perjury that the
foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 2nd day of October, 2010, in Pleasant Hill,
California.


Peter Clark